

Wis.; Rev. August Kirchner, Prof. W. E. Reim, and 18 of the principal business men of the village of Hustisford, Wis., asking for the passage of S. 6688, or any similar measure to levy an embargo on all contraband of war save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Judge J. E. Uselding, Hon. Albert W. Grady, and 56 other citizens of the city of Port Washington, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of House joint resolution 377, to levy an embargo upon and prohibit the exportation from this country to European countries now at war of all arms, munitions of war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. William Weber and 76 other citizens, of Allenton, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of S. 6688, or any similar measure to prohibit the exportation of all munitions and contraband of war to belligerent countries save foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Rud. F. W. Pietz and 55 other citizens, of Lomira, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: Memorial of St. Paul's Fifth Reformed Church, of Baltimore, Md., favoring strict neutrality by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Memorial of Krieger Verein, of Elmhurst, and citizens of Dundee, Ill., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to munitions of war from American ports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, German Roman Catholic Central Verein, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring maintaining strict neutrality of United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of Danbury, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 31 citizens of Belvue and Paxico, Kans., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 10 Civil War veterans, asking for the repeal of the act of March 3, 1879, interpreting the act of January 25, 1879, relating to arrears of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Christ Evangelical Church, Paterson, N. J., relative to violation of the spirit of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of citizens of Hoboken, N. J., relative to violation of the spirit of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition signed by Louis W. Silberschmidt and 138 other citizens of La Crosse, Wis., urging support of a resolution prohibiting the exportation of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by Oscar Kramer and 64 other citizens of La Crosse, Wis., urging support of a resolution prohibiting the exportation of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by F. P. Popp and 105 other residents of Ableman, Wis., urging the passage of the resolution prohibiting the exportation of munitions of war from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by Frank Gudenschwager and 29 other residents of Lime Ridge, Wis., urging the passage of a resolution prohibiting the exportation of munitions of war from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by Rev. J. T. Gamm and 260 other citizens of La Crosse, Wis., urging support of a resolution prohibiting the exportation of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petitions of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Illinois, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to exportation of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of business men of the State of Illinois, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of Charles Margraff and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 20859, a bill to increase pension of Thomas H. Wriston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: Petition of 530 business firms of the State of Utah, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative

to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of business men of Mount Pleasant, West Burlington, Montrose, and New London, Iowa, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of West Point and Donnellson, Iowa, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Norwich, Conn., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit exportation of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POST: Petition of various citizens of New Holland and Williamsport, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Ralph H. Sirchert, of Passaic, N. J., relative to neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of 300 members of the German Presbyterian Church of Peace, relative to violation of the spirit of neutrality in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 750 citizens of Illinois; St. Joseph Society, of St. Louis, Mo.; Roman Catholic Mutual Protective Society, of Muscatine, Iowa; and German Evangelical Protestant Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting exportation of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 15, 1915.

Right Rev. Julius W. Atwood, D. D., bishop of Arizona, offered the following prayer:

Direct, O Lord, the Members of this Senate with Thy most gracious favor and further them with Thy continual help, that in all their works begun, continued, and ended in Thee they may do Thy holy will and realize the truth of all Thy Son's life and teaching, that in serving the State and the Nation they also serve their Father and their God. Listen to us as we join in the words Thy dear Son taught us to pray: Our Father, who art in heaven. Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes in order that I may correct a misstatement that has gone into the RECORD.

It has just come to my knowledge that on the day before yesterday in the Senate, during my unavoidable absence from the Chamber, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made an incorrect statement about the status of House bill 16673, the water-power bill. Of course, I know the Senator from Idaho would not knowingly make a misstatement about any matter, material or immaterial, but, nevertheless, he was mistaken in the statement which he made.

He stated that at that time the bill was still in the Committee on Public Lands and had not been reported out. That was not correct. The bill was reported favorably with amendments on Monday of this week, and is now on the Senate calendar and was when the Senator from Idaho was speaking. The committee took final action on the bill about the middle of last week. It took several days to prepare and write the report, and the bill was reported on Monday last.

Of course, I know it had not long been reported—only a few days—when the Senator from Idaho inadvertently made that statement, but I do not want the statement that the bill is still in the hands of the committee and not reported out to go into the RECORD without being corrected.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. MYERS. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. I have not looked at the RECORD, but my recollection of the remarks of the Senator from Idaho is that he stated the bill had not been reported at the time the President made his speech at Indianapolis.

Mr. MYERS. And also at the time he was speaking.

Mr. JONES. I do not think so, Mr. President.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I do not want to attribute to the Senator from Idaho anything he did not say, but the RECORD reports him as saying what I have indicated; and I want to make it plain that the bill was reported out on Monday of this week.

Mr. JONES. Of course, the Senator does not pretend to state that the report had been made when the President made his speech at Indianapolis.

Mr. MYERS. I do not. I mean just what I have said, and I am stating the facts correctly. The power bill is now out of committee and on the calendar and has been all of this week. At the same time the Senator from Idaho made some criticism. I have learned, of the bill and of the President for his approval of it and stated that some western Senators were opposed to the measure. I will not contend about those things at this time nor enter into any controversy about them; it is not necessary. There will be a proper time for that. It is true that some western Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, are opposed to the bill, but it is sufficient to say at this time that the bill was ordered favorably reported by a large majority of the Public Lands Committee, there being both Democrats and Republicans on the committee supporting the motion; and it has a number of warm supporters among western Senators, both Democrats and Republicans.

When the bill may come before the Senate for consideration and final disposition it will be earnestly supported and championed, and its merits will be well presented to the Senate by a number of Senators, both Democrats and Republicans. It will be well cared for. As to the fact that the President gives it his support, those of us who are in favor of the bill consider it as one of the evidences of its merits that it has the hearty approval of both the President and the Secretary of the Interior. I have no apprehension about the final disposition of the bill. The only thing about which I am solicitous is to get it before the Senate for its consideration and final disposition, and when that shall be done I am satisfied as to what the result will be. The measure possesses much merit and has strong support, both in and out of Congress.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1489).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1490).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

#### CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of LEE S. OVERMAN, chosen by the electors of the State of North Carolina a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 5168. An act for the relief of the King Theological Hall, and authorizing the conveyance of real estate to the Howard University and other grantees; and

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of the Atlantic Canning Co.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a petition, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not understand the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas asks for the reading of a petition. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read it.

The petition was read, as follows:

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, representing 1,200 women, assembled this January 14, 1915, in a

day of prayer for the furtherance of prohibition in our loved land, most earnestly petition both Houses of Congress to grant us prohibition for the District of Columbia and national constitutional prohibition for our loved Nation.

Mrs. EMMA SANFORD SHELTON,  
President.  
Mrs. E. S. HENRY,  
Corresponding Secretary.  
Mrs. B. A. LINEBACK,  
Recording Secretary.  
Mrs. THEO. T. MOORE,  
Treasurer.  
Mrs. MARGARET DYE ELLIS,  
Legislative Superintendent for National  
Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present a number of telegrams I have received protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia. I will state that these are only a few of over 200 that I have received. I simply present them that they may be recorded.

The telegrams were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOBOKEN, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please do your utmost to prevent the passage of the bill before the Senate to make the District of Columbia dry.

WILLIAM BRANDES.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed to making District of Columbia dry and ask you kindly to vote against measure.

FARMERS' HOTEL,  
JOSEPH BLIMM, Proprietor.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you please vote against making District of Columbia dry.

HILAIRE C. BLATZ.

HOBOKEN, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please do your utmost to prevent the passage of the bill before the Senate to make the District of Columbia dry.

Mr. BUGEVICH.

HOBOKEN, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES F. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please do your utmost to prevent the passage of the bill before the Senate to make the District of Columbia dry.

R. NAEGELIS SONS.

HOBOKEN, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES F. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please do your utmost to prevent the passage of the bill before the Senate to make the District of Columbia dry.

KAHN BROS.

HOBOKEN, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES F. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please do your utmost to prevent the passage of the bill before the Senate to make the District of Columbia dry.

GUSTAV ETTLING.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., January 13, 1915.

Senator JAMES F. MARTINE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please vote against making District of Columbia dry. Very unreasonable, unjust.

QUEEN CITY HOTEL,  
By PETER FLOERSCH, Proprietor.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Manchester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate shipment of convict-made goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of the Excelsior No Surrender Royal Orange Lodge, of Lewiston, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Sylvan Grove and Andale, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Frankfort, Kans., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic



publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of the Humane Society of Lowell, Mass., remonstrating against the sale of American horses to any foreign country for the purposes of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Saginaw, Detroit, Benton Harbor, Lansing, Unionville, and Montague, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### SHIPMENTS OF HORSES FOR EUROPEAN WAR.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, if it is proper at this time, I desire to present a letter from one of my constituents touching upon a subject that has appealed to me very much since the war in Europe, and it seems to me that it is one that should appeal to every human being—the horrible destruction of horses that are required in artillery and for various uses in the war. The article goes on to say, and I echo it with a great deal of gusto, that while we have prohibited the sale of submarines, we have placed no embargo on these poor brutes which are being bought by thousands in our land and shipped to Europe, where the greater part of them are helpless and crippled, writhing in pain and agony on the battle field. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WOODBURY, N. J., January 4, 1915.

To the Hon. J. E. MARTINE,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Shall American horses be shipped for slaughter on European battle fields?

The United States Government has prevented the sale to European belligerents of American submarines, but permits the sale of American horses, thereby laying itself open to the charge of violation of our spirit of honest neutrality.

It is said that over 50,000 American horses have already been purchased for this purpose. The great majority of these will die from wounds, exhaustion, shell fire, starvation, injuries, and ill treatment.

In permitting this traffic, which means so much excessive cruelty to our horses, are we true to any principle of humanity? Are we fair as neutrals?

If we are to violate our duty as neutrals, we might better send arms and ammunition rather than ship these living sacrifices to the god of war.

As one strongly interested in humanitarian work among horses, I protest against this inhuman traffic and beg that you will use your influence that action shall be taken which shall stop these foreign shipment of horses until the war is at an end.

Very respectfully, yours,

SEBYL T. JONES.

Mr. GALLINGER. In this connection I will state that my attention has been called to a statement to the effect that the horses we are shipping from this country to the European nations survive, on the average, only a few days—two or three weeks at the longest—after they have been impressed into service. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can only say that I think, mayhap, it is in common with the experience we had in our own war. I remember the agents bought a great many poor, miserable cripples and palmed them off on the Government. I have no doubt that is true; but still the fact is true that superb specimens of that brute creation are bought and carried over and lined up in battle and shot down, maimed and crippled, and that they die writhing in pain and agony. God knows my heart goes out for them.

Mr. GALLINGER. So does mine.

#### SERVICE ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan in reference to the so-called seamen's bill. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Concurrent resolution adopted by the Michigan State Legislature.

Whereas there is pending before Congress Senate bill No. 136, intended, through drastic regulations, to protect passengers upon boats plying on the ocean and the Great Lakes which if enacted would virtually put out of business all passenger-boat lines operating upon the said Great Lakes; and

Whereas the passenger season on the Great Lakes is only for three months in midsummer, and steamers are passing and repassing each other at very short intervals, so that assistance is always near at hand in the case of any accident, the risk of casualties being reduced to a minimum, and is entirely different from the dangers on the ocean; and

Whereas millions of passengers have been carried and no loss of life has occurred on any of the passenger boats plying on said lakes during the last 10 years; and

Whereas whatever loss of life has occurred in that time on these lakes has been upon freight carriers which operate late in the season, and the bulk of such loss occurring during that part of the season and at a time when passenger and excursion boats are laid up for the winter; and

Whereas many millions of dollars are invested in said passenger and excursion boats, built under Government regulations, inspection, and supervision, which under the proposed bill would become almost a total loss and many thousands of persons be thrown out of employment; and

Whereas if under these conditions Congress should insist on enacting the proposed legislation, we feel that the excursion and passenger steamers of the Great Lakes should be exempted from the provisions of the bill: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Michigan respectfully asks the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact the proposed measure enumerated above as applied to the Great Lakes and for the reasons contained in the preamble hereof; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to each of the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States, and they are hereby respectfully requested to oppose by all honorable means the enactment of this proposed legislation.*

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] regarding excursion boats in the Lake service I wish to have printed in the RECORD and will ask to have read from the desk an extract from a report made by the board of education of Chicago, which instituted an investigation regarding this excursion service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

REPORT OF THE CHICAGO SCHOOL CENSUS OF 1914 AND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF COMPULSORY EDUCATION.

[Pages 31 and 33.]

#### LAKE BOAT EXCURSION DANGERS.

In June and July the department, at the suggestion of Dean Walter T. Sumner, of the school management committee, approved by the superintendent of schools, conducted an investigation of conditions on the lake excursion boats, so extensively patronized by school children during the summer months. Investigators covered these boats for the purpose of making known to parents and the public the conditions found.

It was ascertained that during the summer of 1914 many of these excursion boats were merely floating saloons and that the rule prohibiting sale of liquor to minors was not enforced. The discipline on most of the boats was lax; unescorted young girls were subject to indignities; immoral women and licentious men patronized the boats, and moral conditions were bad, and anyone with "the price" could rent a stateroom. The Government is now following up the investigation. Slot machines, paddle and wheel games gave children their first lesson in gambling; bars were opened before the 3-mile limit was reached; minors were found drunk; men took indecent liberties with women; and rowdiness was rampant on "big days," especially the Fourth of July. While the majority of passengers conduct themselves properly, there is a vicious and degenerate minority, including a clique of young men who infest the boats, looking upon unescorted young girls as "legitimate prey."

It was found that the boats only carried lifeboats and life rafts to save the lives of 30 per cent of their passengers, and this means that a boat licensed to a capacity of 2,000 to 3,000 passengers during the excursion period—May 15 to October 15—would be able to provide lifeboats and life rafts for less than one-third on board if the boat was crowded to its capacity. These boats are crowded to the rail on holidays and week-end trips. Life preservers are plentiful, but life preservers are not adequate protection for small children. The crews are small, and unless there is amended national legislation to compel excursion boats to increase their lifeboat equipment personal safety on an overcrowded Lake Michigan excursion boat is a risk in which humanity must depend upon fate as to whether it would be numbered among the "one-third saved" or the two-thirds that would be dependent upon life preservers. Among the latter would doubtless be many children with only a circle of cork around them to float their frightened souls to rescue.

It was found that the majority of excursion boats encouraged the gambling spirit among children and that money was accepted from a 6-year-old child to play the paddle game. In this investigation of the conditions on the excursion boats our officers found that the *Christopher Columbus* maintained the best discipline on board among its passengers. No slot machines nor gambling devices of any kind were found on board; six boat patrolmen maintained order, and the moral conditions during the period named were the best of any boat under surveillance. The *City of South Haven* maintains several patrolmen, but, unfortunately, permits games of chance that are patronized by school children. Parents should not permit their children to go on any excursion boat unescorted.

I recommend that the lake excursions of the vacation schools be abandoned until every boat is better equipped with adequate life-saving facilities. The bars on these boats should either be better regulated or eliminated.

Every public place, including amusement parks and theaters, as well as bathing beaches, should be strongly policed by special officers, as well as regular police officers, to make "safety first" apply to the moral protection of women and children. Juvenile delinquency is not a sequel of school life, but a sequel of the life of the school child outside of school hours, and the court records will corroborate this statement.

WILLIAM A. WALLACE.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12220) for the relief of William A. Wallace, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 916) thereon.

## EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 519, authorizing the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to employ an additional clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Table Calendar.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 7297) to regulate the admission into the United States of agricultural products raised on Daigle Island, in the St. John River; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 7298) granting an increase of pension to Arvilla B. Hammond; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 7299) granting a pension to John A. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 7300) granting an increase of pension to David J. Braugher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7301) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hobbs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 7302) providing for the celebration of the semicentennial anniversary of the act of emancipation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7303) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, to prevent overissues of securities by carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 7304) to correct the military record of J. W. Metler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7305) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claim of Mary Clerkin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 7306) granting a pension to Laura E. Eby (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7307) granting a pension to Sarah E. Davis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7308) granting a pension to Mable V. Rake (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7309) granting a pension to John B. Lucas (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7310) granting a pension to Ethel M. Kurfiss (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 7311) granting an increase of pension to Ewander V. Turner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 7312) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Clark; and

A bill (S. 7313) granting an increase of pension to James Gorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 7314) granting an increase of pension to William A. N. Clare (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7315) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Norton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 7316) providing exemption in certain cases from internal-revenue taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 7317) granting an increase of pension to Georgia Nelson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7318) to authorize the issuance of search warrants where probable cause appears for believing that intoxicating liquors are contained in certain places in violation of law and prohibiting the introduction of liquors into States having pro-

hibitory laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STERLING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) providing for the appointment of a joint select committee to investigate and report as to the proper proportion of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia which shall be borne by said District and the United States, respectively, and as to the necessity of any change or revision in the tax laws applicable to said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the support and civilization of Seminole Indians of Florida, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000 to pay Hon. William P. Jackson for expenses incurred by him in the proceedings involving the validity of his credentials and his right to a seat in the United States Senate, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the establishment of a legislative reference division in the Library of Congress, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## DAMS OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 16053) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

## RAILROADS AND RAILROAD SECURITIES.

Mr. OLIVER. I have here a pamphlet entitled "The Problem of the Railroads and Railroad Securities of the United States is the People's Problem." I think it worthy of being published as a public document, but suggest that the application be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pamphlet will be referred to the Committee on Printing with the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

## SUPPLY OF ANILINE DYESTUFFS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 520, submitted yesterday by Mr. POMERENE, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate as fully as possible as to the facts relating to the supply of dyestuffs for American textile and other industries, the sources of such supply, the extent and nature of the supply, the movement of prices, the available materials for the manufacture of such supplies in this country, the possibilities, if any, as to the stoppage of such supply by reason of the existing European war, and any and all such other facts as will bring the existing conditions in the aniline color industry fully to the knowledge of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. At the suggestion of another Senator, I ask that the resolution may lie over without prejudice until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

## NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution I introduced on the 7th of December last may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, which will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) providing for a national security commission, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That a commission is hereby created, to be called the National Security Commission, consisting of three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States. Said commission shall make full investigation,



by subcommittee or otherwise, into the question of the preparedness of the United States for war, defensive or offensive. Said commission shall report to the Congress its findings and shall make such recommendations as in its judgment may seem proper.

For the purpose of said investigation said commission is authorized to send for persons and papers, to make all necessary travel, either in the United States or any foreign country, and to administer oaths. Such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That not more than one Senator and one Member of the House of Representatives appointed on said commission shall be a member either of the Committee on Military Affairs or of the Committee on Naval Affairs of their respective bodies.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, some time since my eye was caught by a letter published in a New York newspaper in regard to this resolution which I have ventured to lay before the Senate. The writer appeared to be one of those persons who feel a deep anxiety for the maintenance of the military force known as the police, who protect their lives and property, but who regard with indifference, if not hostility, the Army and Navy, which are designed to protect the country. The writer's argument is not of importance, but he alluded to the resolution which I have introduced, and one objection to it was that its author was a party man. I think the writer evidently belongs to that class of our citizens who make noises and utter cries like an independent, but who always vote steadily and constantly against the party which they profess to support. It is true that I am a party man. I think it is well to be a party man, and I have for a long time consoled myself when objections to me are made such as the one I have quoted by thinking of what was said many years ago by one of the greatest men in history, and who was at the same time one of the best and wisest. On July 16, 1852, Abraham Lincoln said:

A free people in times of peace and quiet, when pressed by no common danger, naturally divide into parties. At such times the man who is of neither party is not, can not be, of any consequence. Mr. Clay, therefore, was of a party.

Following this opinion expressed by Abraham Lincoln, I have been, as I have just said, a party man. But it does not follow, because I am a party man, that I treat all subjects which come before the country or before Congress from a party standpoint. There are many measures presented to the Senate which are in no sense party questions and upon which, as we all know, Senators vote without reference to their party affiliations. There are also certain great questions into which, in most cases certainly, party considerations are not allowed to enter, and with me the national defense is one, and always has been one, of those questions. Nothing was further from my thoughts or my desires than to make the subject involved in my resolution a party question or seek to gain from it party advantage.

The resolution itself shows, indeed, on its face that no partisan advantage is sought, for it provides that three members of the commission shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House, three by the Vice President, and three by the President of the United States. With such an appointing power, can it be imagined by anyone that I am trying to create a partisan commission which would work in the interest of the Republican Party and against the Democratic Party? If I were I should not seek to have the members of the commission appointed in just that way. For all that has been well and wisely done for our national defense no party as such can take the whole credit, and for what has been left undone no party as such is to blame. Nor is the blame for our deficiencies to be placed upon any administration. Administrations of both parties have as a rule sought, sometimes tepidly and sometimes vigorously, to do what was best for the Army and Navy, and Secretaries of War and Secretaries of the Navy, with scarcely an exception, have labored, some of course with much more ability and efficiency than others, to do all that was best for the forces committed to their charge. The deficiencies in our means of national defense, embodied in the Army and Navy, are almost wholly due to Congress. The responsibility for our military and naval service has been divided among half a dozen committees of the House and Senate. There has never been any comprehensive plan adopted for dealing with our national defenses as a whole or even for dealing with our Army and Navy as separate and complete entities. The result, of course, is a total lack of unity of plan, and Congress has never been willing to follow the advice of the military and naval boards, who were alone competent to set forth comprehensive, intelligent, and far-reaching systems, or to establish what we most need—a council of national defense in which both the executive and legislative branches should be represented. Congress has scattered the appropriations for the two services through half a dozen appropriation bills. It has failed entirely to unite our naval and semi-naval services under one head, so that we have three or four little navies in addition to the large Navy. Congress has sacrificed expenditure for na-

tional defense to expenditures fraught with local popularity, often needless, rarely imperative. It has turned a deaf ear to the recommendation of one Secretary after another, both in the War and Navy Departments, that we should cease wasting money on useless navy yards and stations and stop scattering our soldiers among widely separated posts at points where there was no need of troops. The appropriations have been haphazard, with the result that, although there are many excellent features in the two services, both the Army and Navy are unbalanced—that is, they are strong at one point and weak at another—and one branch or several branches in each of the two services are not properly proportioned to the other branches. It seemed to me that it was extremely important that we should have an inquiry by a commission representing both branches of Congress as well as the Executive, which should be able to examine into the entire question and report upon the entire subject.

I observe that Capt. Winterhalter, before the House committee on December 14, made the following statement:

I do not know what the people want. Put the question to the people and let them decide it.

That is precisely what I desire. I wish the people to have the condition of our national defenses clearly and honestly presented to them, and then decide what they wish to have done. But in order that the people of the United States may understand what the conditions are upon which they are asked to decide they must have those conditions laid before them in a comprehensible manner. It is idle to suppose that a correct public opinion can be formed from the information contained in the examination of Army and Navy officers before half a dozen committees. It is utterly impossible for the average man to examine those hundreds of pages of questions and answers and deduce therefrom a clear idea of what is needed and of what he himself as an American citizen desires. An immense mass of information on the subject of the national defense has been printed in the newspapers, but, as a rule, each article relates to some particular point or to some special branch of one of the two services, and there is no unity or coherence in the result. If the people are to pass intelligently upon this question—and I am sure that they feel a very deep interest in it—they should have the facts presented to them in a clear and condensed form and as the result of an examination conducted by men in whose ability, honesty, and good judgment they have entire confidence. They would then know what the condition was, and they would read it all in comparatively few pages. This is what I should like to see done, and I desire now to give more fully the grounds and reasons for my earnest hope that Congress will take the necessary steps to present to the people of the country all the facts in regard to our national defense in such a manner as to enable the country to reach a decision, a decision which I am sure the people of the United States are more than willing to make when they have once been informed upon the subject.

In the last annual report of the Secretary of War the Secretary makes a statement upon the general question of national defense which seems to me as remarkable for the courage with which facts are faced as it is for the clearness, the strength, and the power with which those facts are stated. I make no apology to the Senate for asking their attention while I read to them the passages to which I refer:

It would be premature to attempt now to draw the ultimate lessons from the war in Europe. It is an imperative duty, however, to heed so much of what it brings home to us as is incontrovertible and not to be changed by any event, leaving for later and more detailed and comprehensive consideration what its later developments and final conclusions may indicate.

For orderly treatment certain preliminary considerations may be usefully adverted to. It is, of course, not necessary to dwell on the blessings of peace and the horrors of war. Everyone desires peace, just as everyone desires health, contentment, affection, sufficient means for comfortable existence, and other similarly beneficent things. But peace and the other states of being just mentioned are not always or even often solely within one's own control. Those who are thoughtful and have courage face the facts of life, take lessons from experience, and strive by wise conduct to attain the desirable things, and by prevision and precaution to protect and defend them when obtained. It may truthfully be said that eternal vigilance is the price which must be paid in order to obtain the desirable things of life and to defend them.

In collective affairs the interests of the group are confided to the Government, and it thereupon is charged with the duty to preserve and defend these things. The Government must exercise for the Nation the precautionary, defensive, and preservative measures necessary to that end. All governments must therefore have force—physical force—i. e., military force, for these purposes. The question for each nation when this matter is under consideration is, How much force should it have and of what should that force consist?

In the early history of our Nation there was a natural, almost inevitable, abhorrence of military force, because it connoted military despotism. Most, if not all, of the early settlers in this country came from nations where a few powerful persons tyrannically imposed their will upon the people by means of military power. The consequence was that the oppressed who fled to this country necessarily connected military force with despotism and had a dread thereof. Of course all



this has long since passed into history. No reasonable person in this country to-day has the slightest shadow of fear of military despotism nor of any interference whatever by military force in the conduct of civil affairs. The military and the civil are just as completely and permanently separated in this country as the church and the state are; the subjection of the military to the civil is settled and unchangeable. The only reason for adverting to the obsolete condition is to anticipate the action of those who will cite from the works of the founders of the Republic excerpts showing a dread of military ascendancy in our Government. Undoubtedly at the time such sentiments were expressed there was a very real dread. At the present time such expressions are entirely inapplicable and do not furnish even a presentable pretext for opposing proper military preparation.

It also seems proper, in passing, to refer to the frame of mind of those who use the word "militarism," as the embodiment of the doctrine of brute force and loosely apply it to any organized preparation of military force, and therefore deprecate any adequate military preparation because it is a step in the direction of the condemned "militarism." It is perfectly apparent to anyone who approaches the matter with an unprejudiced mind that what constitutes undesirable militarism as distinguished from a necessary, proper, and adequate preparation of the military resources of the Nation depends upon the position in which each nation finds itself, and varies with every nation and with different conditions in each nation at different times. Every nation must have adequate force to protect itself from domestic insurrections, to enforce its laws, and to repel invasions; that is, every nation that has similar characteristics to those of a self-respecting man. (The Constitution obliges the United States to protect each State against invasion.) If it prepares and maintains more military force than is necessary for the purposes just named, then it is subject to the conviction, in the public opinion of the world, of having embraced "militarism," unless it intends aggression for a cause which the public opinion of the world conceives to be a righteous one. To the extent, however, that it confines its military preparedness to the purposes first mentioned there is neither warrant nor justification in characterizing such action as "militarism." Those who would thus characterize it do so because they have reached the conclusion that a nation to-day can properly dispense with a prepared military force, and therefore they apply the word to any preparation or organization of the military resources of the nation. Not being able to conceive how a reasonable, prudent, patriotic man can reach such a conclusion, I can not conceive any arguments or statements that would alter such a state of mind. It disregards all known facts, lies in the face of all experience, and must rest upon faith in that which has not yet been made manifest.

Equally useless, in my view, is the discussion frequently indulged in as to whether military preparation tends or does not tend to avoid war. I term such discussion "useless" because, so far as we are concerned, whatever conclusion might be reached thereon would not affect our duty. Since it is not in mind to suggest any military preparation of the Nation's resources beyond that absolutely essential under existing conditions, the question of whether more extensive preparation for the purpose of avoiding war would have that effect or not is futile. Unless this Nation has reached the conclusion that it has no need for the preparation of its military resources for the purposes I have above enumerated, then we must earnestly address ourselves to the question of such proper preparation. I have reached no such conclusion, and in fact am of the firm conviction that no reasonable, prudent man who faces facts could reach such a conclusion. Unless and until the Congress of the United States, representing the people of the country, places on record the conclusion of the people to the contrary, my duty is, I think, entirely clear; and that duty is to set forth the facts and the necessities growing out of the facts, and suggestions as to the ways and means of fulfilling such necessities.

Whatever the future may hold in the way of agreements between nations, followed by actual disarmament thereof, of international courts of arbitration, and other greatly to be desired measures to lessen or prevent conflict between nation and nation, we all know that at present these conditions are not existing. We can and will eagerly adapt ourselves to each beneficent development along these lines; but to merely enfeeble ourselves in the meantime would, in my view, be unthinkable folly. By neglecting and refusing to provide ourselves with the necessary means of self-protection and self-defense we could not hasten or in any way favorably influence the ultimate results we desire in these respects.

What, then, does this Nation need in the way of military preparedness? Of course I am not attempting to lay down a counsel of perfection—that is, an extensive scheme which is ideal in its completeness. Such a scheme might well be considered and studied and adopted after long study. But to await the result of such a course would be to continue the undesirable situation in which we have so long been. In my view it is much better to do those things which lie nearest at hand and can be done than to remain as we are, without moving along proper lines until a more comprehensive and perfect scheme can be agreed upon. Nothing done along the lines I am about to suggest will interfere with the carrying out of a more comprehensive and maturely developed plan, but, on the contrary, will fit into it exactly.

To the statement which I have just read and to the arguments contained therein as to the general proposition of provisions for national self-defense, it would be well-nigh impossible to make any substantial additions. But it can not be too often reiterated that the Constitution itself contemplates the maintenance of an Army, and in the clause relating to the militia speaks of the enforcement of the laws, domestic insurrections, and foreign invasion as the purposes for which the forces of the United States should be established and if the necessity arises should be employed. That we ought to have an adequate national defense well prepared in time of peace to meet the exigencies of war was clearly contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. It is true that more than 125 years have elapsed since that great instrument was adopted, but it is not apparent, despite the advances which have been made in the direction of arbitrating international disputes, that the danger of war has been materially lessened since 1787. On the contrary we are at this moment in the presence of a war which in its extent and in the death, destruction, and suffering that it is causing goes far beyond anything which the framers of the Constitution could have imagined. Our organic

law therefore directs us to make provision for national defense, and the only question is whether under existing conditions that defense is at present adequate.

I propose briefly to enumerate certain points where the plain facts, comprehensible by everyone, or the evidence of those most competent to judge prove that our means of self-defense are either woefully inadequate or wholly lacking. Before doing so I wish to call attention to the expenditure caused in times of peace by the wars in which we have been engaged and contrast it with the expenditure of the Government in preparing in time of peace a proper national defense so that we might be reasonably ready when war comes, if come it must.

In the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1910 there is a table which seems to me of interest in this connection. It shows the relation of our average naval expenditure, by decades, to the average valuation of the property of the country, also by decades, from 1800 to 1910. This table has many points of interest. It shows that the percentage of naval expenditure to the value of the property of the country is largest in the decade from 1810 to 1820, reaching in that period .0026 per cent. The lowest was in the decade from 1880 to 1890, when the percentage of naval expenditure was .0003 per cent. In the decade from 1900 to 1910 it was .0009 per cent, the lowest that we have had since 1800 except in the decades from 1850 to 1860, 1870 to 1880, 1880 to 1890, and 1890 to 1900. After the War of 1812 the percentage of naval expenditures to the wealth of the country ranged from .0026 per cent to .0015 per cent, dropping to .0009 per cent in the decade from 1850 to 1860. After the Civil War it declined to the lowest point ever reached, and is now, as I have said, less than it has been in all but four decades of our history. Surely .0009 per cent is not a large amount to pay merely as an insurance. The Navy, in the nature of things, is our principle defense, and to compel \$110,000,000,000 of property to pay .0009 per cent toward its own protection does not seem an unreasonable or excessive burden.

Years.	Average valuation computed.	Average naval expenditure.	Percentage.
1801-1810.....	\$1,321,245,000	\$1,636,732	0.00123
1811-1820.....	1,732,470,000	4,675,502	.00269
1821-1830.....	2,335,930,000	3,295,086	.00141
1831-1840.....	3,301,915,000	5,041,751	.00152
1841-1850.....	5,637,199,000	7,237,696	.00129
1851-1860.....	12,198,889,800	11,996,977	.00098
1861-1870.....	23,718,414,100	46,848,730	.00197
1871-1880.....	36,983,933,100	19,658,796	.00053
1881-1890.....	54,959,300,050	16,867,629	.00030
1891-1900.....	81,131,690,960	38,635,164	.00047
1901-1910.....	110,000,000,000	100,678,000	.00091
General average.....			.00120

Since the foundation of the Government we have paid in pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, on account of services in the several wars in which we have been engaged, including cost of maintenance, \$4,857,895,843.73. The total expenditure for the Navy from 1794 to 1914 was \$3,071,179,958.99. Deducting, as we should in order to get the expenditure in time of peace, the expenditure on the Navy during our years of war—10 in all—we find that the Navy in time of peace has cost the Government \$2,663,294,530.50. The total disbursements for the War Department from the foundation of the Government are \$7,484,348,144.26. Deducting the disbursements for the 10 years of war, which were \$3,058,759,659.96, and the disbursements for rivers and harbors, which were \$753,448,939.30, we find that the total disbursements for the War Department in time of peace were \$3,672,139,544.50. The total disbursements for the two services in time of peace from the foundation of the Government were \$6,335,434,075, which is only \$1,477,538,231.27 more than the amount expended in pensions.

It is also interesting to make a comparison of the expenditures from 1866 to the present time, because the pension disbursements have been largely made since the Civil War. The river and harbor appropriations, amounting to \$687,203,329.31, must be deducted from the military disbursements for that period. I have been unable to get the figures from 1866 to 1875, so that for those nine years the river and harbor disbursements are included, although they ought not to be, in the table of the War Department expenditures. Made up in this way the figures stand from 1866 to 1914, inclusive: Army, after deducting the appropriations for rivers and harbors from 1875 to 1914 and leaving in those made between 1866 and 1874, inclusive, \$3,296,448,378.47; and the Navy, \$2,345,306,671.82; a total for the two services of \$5,641,755,050.29. The appropriations for pensions for the same period, from 1866 to 1914, inclusive, including those for maintenance, amount to \$4,761,450,-



399.50. It will be observed, therefore, that our expenditures for past wars come within \$900,000,000 of equaling the expenditures for both the Army and Navy during the same period. Having spent so much money for past wars certainly it is not too much to ask that we make proper appropriations for future wars in which the country may unhappily be engaged, and to take care of the men who may be called upon to defend their country in wars of the future, as well and generously as we have taken care of the men who have fought the wars of past times.

I now come to the condition of our defenses at the present moment, and I will begin with the Army. On June 30, 1914, the Regular Army of the United States consisted of 4,701 officers and 87,781 men; 758 officers and 17,901 men belong to the Coast Artillery and are therefore stationary in coast defenses; 1,008 officers and 18,434 men belong to the staff, technical, and non-combatant branches of the Army, including recruits and men engaged in recruiting. This leaves a mobile Army composed of 2,935 officers and 51,446 men. Of those 9,572 are in the Philippine Islands, 8,195 in Hawaii, 2,179 in the Canal Zone, 849 in China, 862 in Alaska, 707 in Porto Rico, troops en route and officers at other foreign stations, 1,449. This left a mobile Army force in continental United States on June 30, 1914, of 1,495 officers and 29,405 men.

The Secretary of War states that in the very near future it will be necessary to take from the United States and put in the Philippine Islands 13 companies of Coast Artillery, comprising 1,950 men; in the Hawaiian Islands, 6,380 men; and in the Canal Zone, 4,774 men; and the Secretary adds that he does not think the Canal Zone force will be sufficient even when this addition is made. So long as we hold the Philippine Islands we must have a force there adequate for their defense. The Hawaiian Islands are one of our most important outposts and we need and must maintain there a considerable force. We can not therefore look for any addition to the mobile force in the continental United States from either of these sources; on the contrary, it is probable that further drafts on our Army will be necessary in both places. The Panama Canal Zone is more important to us for our national defense than anything else. At the present moment it is miserably and most inadequately protected. It is not enough to have fortifications to guard the ends of the canal. We must maintain there a force sufficient to protect the canal, so far as it is humanly possible, throughout its entire length. The canal is a delicate piece of mechanism. Explosives rightly placed would block it in a moment. There would be—there is at all times—great danger that the agents or spies of a hostile nation might make their way to some point on the borders of the canal and in a moment render it useless for weeks and perhaps for months. This is a danger to be guarded against most vigilantly, and although the Secretary proposes to raise the protecting force there to practically 7,000 men, he frankly states that such a force will not be sufficient. Porto Rico and Alaska must of course have forces sufficient for their protection. For these obvious reasons we can not hope to reduce the numbers in our detachments employed in necessary and, in the case of the Canal Zone, vital service outside the continental United States, and thus with the additions to these outlying posts, which must be made very shortly, we are left in the continental United States with 12,610 Coast Artillery troops and 24,602 men composing our entire mobile force, which, as the Secretary points out, is not much more than twice the size of the police force of the city of New York. Surely it is not necessary to do more than repeat these figures to show the utter inadequacy of our Regular Army for the absolutely necessary duties which must be performed in time of peace and the painful insufficiency of our mobile forces for any effective defense if we were to be attacked by a powerful enemy. Can there be any doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that the regular forces of the United States ought to be increased to at least the very moderate extent of 25,000 additional men, as recommended by the Secretary of War?

I pass now from the Regular Army, in which we are so clearly deficient, to our provision for supplying waste and losses which occur in any army when war begins. What means have we of filling the gaps which war would make? The reserves which we have of soldiers who have served in the Army, and who under the terms of their enlistment are liable to be called back to the colors, amount to 16 men. In other words, we have no reserves with which rapidly to enlarge the Army of the United States if we were to be attacked. We have no reserves with which to fill the waste of war in our little mobile Army. We should be forced to rely on volunteers for that purpose, and to give volunteers even the rudest kind of training in order to make them fit to be placed in the line would consume months. Even if we get the volunteers we have no officers ready to take commands. Even now we are short of

officers, and the Secretary points out that the instruction of the Organized Militia suffers woefully from the lack of officers available for that service. Is it not clear and beyond dispute that we should make some provision for reserves who can be called to the colors, composed of men already trained who have their equipment, who are prepared, and who can take their place in the line as soon as they are mobilized? Is it not equally clear that we should increase the number of our officers so that we may have enough officers in case of war to take command in these reserves? Officers can not be improvised; they must be trained and educated. But we are making no effort and doing nothing toward increasing our supply of officers, although we have the best Military Academy in the world ready to give instruction to any number of officers that we may need.

The other branch of our national defense is the militia. The fundamental difficulty in regard to the militia resides in our form of government. They are State forces, under 46 different heads, and to bring them into the service and put them under command of the United States is no easy matter. We can not depend upon them to take the place of proper reserves, who by law have been trained in the Regular Army or under regular officers, and who by the terms of their enlistment or of their volunteer service can be mobilized and called to the colors on short notice. Yet the militia is of undoubted value, and should have all the encouragement that Congress can give it. It is a good training school both for officers and men. If the militia is brought to a high state of efficiency we could undoubtedly draw from it officers and men who could at once be incorporated with the forces of the United States as volunteers.

But what are the numbers of this militia force? On June 30, 1914, it numbered 8,323 officers and 119,087 men. They are required under the acts of Congress, and in order to obtain the official financial aid authorized by Congress to attend 24 drills in a year and give 5 days annually in the field. The Secretary of War says it is inconceivable that even if all the National Guard were summoned in the event of war that all would respond, and the statistics of the drills and maneuvers and of the rifle range throw some light on the possibilities of the militia when the call to arms arrives. If you will examine the report of the Chief of Staff and those of his predecessor, you will find that over 24,000 members of the militia did not even appear for inspection last year, over 33,000 did not appear at the annual encampment, and 44,000, or 40 per cent of all the militiamen, did not even appear on the rifle range. It also appears that 60 per cent of the men in the militia who were armed with a rifle did not know how to use it properly, for 60 per cent were unable to qualify last year as second-class marksmen. Forty-four thousand, as I have just said, did not appear on the rifle range. Only about two-thirds of the militia, 67,000 in round numbers, have availed themselves of the opportunity of rifle practice, and of these 66,974 officers and men only 42,599 qualified as second-class marksmen or better. It therefore follows that of all the officers and men of the Organized Militia who participated in rifle practice only 38.3 per cent have reached that stage of proficiency which marks them as suitable for battle purposes. (See p. 257, Report of the Chief of Militia Affairs, and pp. 6 and 7 of Report of Chief of Staff.) The total absenteeism from inspection was 639 officers and 23,467 men. From the camps of instruction there was a total absenteeism of 1,428 officers and 31,855 enlisted men (pp. 6 and 7, Chief of Staff).

From the above figures it will be seen that only 81.7 per cent of the officers and men of the Organized Militia attended the annual inspections; that only 73.87 per cent of the officers and men attended the camps of instruction; that the number of men who had any practice with the rifle during 1913 was 52.56 per cent; and that only 33.43 per cent qualified as second-class marksmen or better. The regulations require that units of the organized Militia shall have at least 24 drills of one hour each per annum. In a majority of the States these requirements were fully met as regards the organizations, yet in a majority of organizations there were a number of enlisted men who failed to attend 24 times for drill and instruction during the calendar year 1913. The total number so failing to attend during 1913 was 37,874 men out of a total of 119,087. The Chief of Staff also states that there is no indication of the number of practice marches held by the units of the Organized Militia, but that it is believed to be a safe conclusion that not a single unit at its maximum strength marched a distance of 10 miles fully equipped and armed.

The militia is deficient, according to the Chief of Staff (p. 7), in the following units to make it a properly balanced and efficient field force:

Fifty-four troops of Cavalry.

Seventy-nine batteries of Field Artillery.



Fourteen companies of Engineers.  
Thirty-four ambulance companies.  
Twelve field hospitals.

The militia can be made a most valuable force for the defense of the country. A proportion of the militia is now available, but it is not all available; and when we look at these figures can we not see that it is inadequate, both in numbers and training, for a great and sudden exigency? Is there not room for some wise legislation in this respect?

But suppose that we have our volunteers and our militia trained; how well can we equip them? The Secretary of War says that we have enough small arms and small-arms ammunition and equipment, figured roughly, for the 500,000 men that would have to be called into the field in any large emergency. Just what does that mean? I understand we have 196,000,000 rounds of ammunition for small arms, which would be enough to equip a mobile army of about 450,000. It makes no provision for reserves of ammunition. It is, I believe, only one-third of what the estimates of the general board, made before the European war came, required for a really sufficient supply. Now, consider what Gen. Wotherspoon recommends in his report since the European war. In the first place, he thinks we ought to have 800,000 men instead of 500,000, including the militia, and here is what he says in his report as to ammunition (p. 12):

No attempt will be made to enter into particulars as to the character of supplies that it will be necessary to accumulate and store for the use of such forces as are contemplated in the above scheme; that is, a regular mobile army, including its reserves of 500,000 men, and a force of 300,000 mobile Organized Militia troops, including its reserves. One illustration will be sufficient, and that will be taken from the munitions most necessary in war, as rifles and field artillery. The proper proportion of rifles in a force of this character, including the Cavalry, which is armed with the rifle, would be 642,541. The minimum accumulated supply of rifle ammunition, based on 1,000 rounds per rifle, should be 646,000,000 rounds.

The Secretary of War also says that we have nothing like sufficient artillery and artillery ammunition. As for the deficiency in artillery, it is only necessary to examine the report of the Chief of the Division of Militia Affairs to learn how deficient the militia is in field artillery. (See p. 229.) It there appears that there is only 1 among the 12 divisional districts—the sixth or New York district—which has adequate artillery protection. The Coast Artillery Militia is 11,000 men short of the number required to man one-half the gun defenses in the continental limits of the United States. If raised to war strength, the existing organizations would still be 5,000 men short of their complement for this service. (See p. 277, Chief of Militia Affairs.)

There are but 550 horses available for the use in drill and instruction of the militia cavalry, which aggregates 4,940 officers and enlisted men. The deficiency in horses for the Field Artillery is even greater than that of the Cavalry. There are no animals for the signal or sanitary troops. In regard to wagon transportation, the militia, as now organized, is deficient 1,934 wagons, and should the militia be assembled into divisions and separate brigades the deficit would be 5,836 wagons. There are no draft animals available.

I have made no statement in regard to the militia which is not taken from the official reports of the Chief of Staff or of the Chief of the Division of Militia Affairs; and it seems to me that no intelligent man can read those figures and consider those facts without realizing what we have to rely on if the militia as a force is suddenly called out to defend the country against invasion. Is it not apparent that we need the legislation recommended by the department in regard to the militia?

Putting the number of infantrymen now in the Regular Army and Organized Militia at approximately 138,000, there are in the regular service and the militia 98 batteries of 4 guns each—the regular number—making 2.84 guns per thousand infantrymen. It is considered, however, that in proportioning the number of guns for an army the Cavalry should be included, and on this basis, since there are 19,800 cavalymen in the regular service and the militia, the guns are in the ratio of 2.48 per thousand Infantry and Cavalry. I understand that in the French Army the number of guns per thousand Infantry and Cavalry is 6½, and in the German Army 7 per thousand. This gives an idea of how very unbalanced our Army is at present and how deficient it is in field artillery. It should be said, however, that in addition to the guns in the hands of the troops there are now manufactured and in reserve 242 guns, making 634 in all available. These include the various calibers which make up light and heavy field artillery. There are appropriated for and under manufacture 226 additional guns, making 860 as the total number on hand or under manufacture, a ratio of 5.44 guns per thousand for Infantry and Cavalry actually in the service. But the department's scheme for the supply of

material for the Army contemplates a mobile force of 450,000 men in the United States, organized into six field armies, in addition to the Coast Artillery and the garrisons of the outlying possessions. Artillery takes longer to manufacture than the other arms and equipment, and the scheme is intended to provide for seven field armies in the United States, in addition to that required for the troops in the outlying possessions, at a ratio of about 3.16 guns per thousand Infantry and Cavalry, with a total of 1,292 guns, or 323 batteries; so that even on a basis of a little over 3 guns per thousand we are still short, counting those on hand or under manufacture, 432 guns, or 108 batteries. In other words, we are short of batteries; we need more men, more horses, and more equipment for our field artillery, which is now so lamentably deficient.

Let us now consider what the Chief of Staff in his last report said (p. 12), in view of what has taken place in Europe:

The proper proportion of field and heavy guns of the mobile type, and exclusive of the gigantic engines of war of more recent introduction, drawn by tractors, no types of which have as yet been developed in this country, would be 2,834. The ammunition for this type of guns, based upon a supply of 5,000 rounds per light field gun, with a corresponding proportion for the heavier field guns, a conservative estimate, if we regard the examples of the great military nations, would be 11,790,850 rounds. It is sufficient to point out that at the present time we have on hand and being manufactured 698,374 United States rifles (model 1903) and 241,000,000 rounds of ammunition for these rifles, 852 field guns and 580,098 rounds of ammunition for these guns. The number of guns per thousand men used in the calculation as to the total number required in the above estimate as to force is five, that number being considerably below the average in European armies. It should also be remembered that large numbers of guns and large masses of ammunition are, in an active war, liable to capture and destruction, and that to start into field operations with the expectation that the proportions given will be maintained without large sources of manufacture would be fallacious. As the factories and works in this country which can produce munitions of war of the above character are exceedingly limited, it is evident that a full supply of this type of matériel must be stored and ready for use before war is undertaken.

As to the guns in our fortifications for harbor defense it would appear from all the available testimony that the guns we now have are of shorter range than those carried by foreign warships of latest design. The Chief of Coast Artillery says in his last report (p. 7):

The question of the size and power of the guns required for the defense of Cape Henry has been brought up. In view of the fact that foreign warships of the latest design are to carry guns larger than 14 inches in caliber and of the highest ballistic power, and in view of the fact that if the defenses at Cape Henry were subjected to a naval attack it would be possible for a naval enemy to bring many battleships carrying 8 to 12 large-caliber guns per ship and to concentrate their fire on the Cape Henry fortifications, and in view also of the fact that coast fortifications are not restricted by reason of weight or space in mounting and using effectively the largest caliber of guns and guns of the highest power, the Chief of Coast Artillery has recommended that the type gun for the Cape Henry fortifications be a 16-inch, 50-caliber gun; otherwise these fortifications may be subjected not only to a very much greater volume of fire than can be delivered by them, but also have the disadvantage of replying to that fire with guns of inferior power, both by reason of the diameter of the bore of the gun and by reason of its shorter length, it being understood that for any given diameter of bore the power of the gun is a direct function of its length.

When Gen. Wood gave his testimony—I think a year ago—he based his calculation of ammunition on the capacity of one gun to fire 200 rounds. We have an official report that in one engagement a French gun fired 600 rounds. So Gen. Wood's estimate was certainly not excessive.

If guns of a larger caliber are needed at Cape Henry, as seems to be demonstrated by the Chief of Coast Artillery, it can be seen that this would apply to every harbor fortification in the country, and that we are deficient in guns of sufficiently large caliber to meet the latest and largest ships in foreign navies.

In machine guns we are better prepared. We have 1,000 automatic machine rifles, and 1,361 are estimated as required for the Army. Of the 361 still needed, 60 were covered by the estimates for the pending Army bill, but the war in Europe seems to indicate that we should increase our estimate of the number of machine guns ultimately needed.

We have practically no motor trucks for transport. We have no armored motor cars mounted with machine guns. The difficulty appears to be, according to the War Department, that no satisfactory motor truck has yet been developed in the United States. It is quite true that Canada has bought a number of motor trucks made in the United States, and apparently thinks them entirely sufficient for use in the field; but we are waiting, as it would seem, until we can get a perfect truck, and only experiment with them. It would seem that it would be better to have motor transportation and armored motor cars provided for with the best truck available than to go without any motor transportation and any armored motor cars at all until a perfect truck has been developed. The main fact remains that we have neither.

As to mines for harbor defense, we apparently have a sufficient number—about 5,000—but we are short of cable, and mines without the necessary cable are practically useless. The trouble



here has been in insufficient appropriations. We also need for our coast defense an enlarged boat service for various purposes, but particularly we require mine planters which go along the coast visiting coast defenses annually as itinerant schools for mine instruction and local mine-defense boats necessary for planting the mines provided for each harbor. It is well that we have the mines, but if we have not the cable to connect them or

the boats to plant them when necessity arrives they would not be very formidable or very protective.

I now come to the Navy, and I print as part of my speech a table of sea strength prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence and dated July 1, 1914, and the warship tonnage of the principal naval powers from the same office under the same date:

#### Sea strength.

In order to answer the frequent inquiries of societies and persons throughout the country interested in the maintenance of the Navy and its relative strength and importance in comparison with foreign navies, the following information has been compiled:

#### VESSELS BUILT.

	Battleships, dread-naught type. <sup>1</sup>	Battle-ships. <sup>2</sup>	Battle cruisers. <sup>3</sup>	Armored cruisers.	Cruisers. <sup>4</sup>	Destroy-ers.	Torpedo boats.	Sub-marines.	Coast-defense vessels. <sup>5</sup>
England.....	20	40	9	34	74	167	49	75	0
Germany.....	13	20	4	9	41	130	0	27	2
United States.....	8	22	0	11	14	51	13	30	4
France.....	4	18	0	20	9	84	135	64	1
Japan.....	2	13	2	13	13	50	27	13	2
Russia.....	0	7	0	6	9	91	14	30	2
Italy.....	3	8	0	9	6	32	68	19	0
Austria-Hungary.....	3	6	0	2	5	18	39	6	6

<sup>1</sup> Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).

<sup>2</sup> Battleships of (about) 10,000 tons or more displacement, and having more than one caliber in the main battery.

<sup>3</sup> Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery, and a decrease in armor protection.

<sup>4</sup> Includes all unarmored cruising vessels above 1,500 tons displacement.

<sup>5</sup> Includes smaller battleships and monitors. No more vessels of this class are being proposed or built by the great powers.

<sup>6</sup> Includes vessels of colonies.

#### VESSELS BUILDING OR AUTHORIZED.

	Battle-ships, dread-naught type.	Battle cruisers.	Cruisers.	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.	Subma-rines.
England <sup>1</sup> .....	16	1	<sup>2</sup> 17	<sup>2</sup> 21	0	22
Germany <sup>3</sup> .....	7	4	5	24	0	18
United States.....	4	0	0	11	0	19
France.....	8	0	0	3	0	22
Japan <sup>4</sup> .....	4	2	0	2	0	2
Russia <sup>5</sup> .....	7	4	8	44	0	19
Italy.....	7	0	2	15	2	8
Austria-Hungary.....	4	0	5	1	24	6

<sup>1</sup> England has no continuing shipbuilding policy, but usually lays down each year 4 or 5 armored ships with a proportional number of smaller vessels.

<sup>2</sup> Includes vessels of colonies.

<sup>3</sup> Germany has a continuing shipbuilding program, governed by a fleet law authorized by the Reichstag. For 1913 there are authorized 1 battleship, 1 battle cruiser, 2 cruisers, 12 destroyers. Eventual strength to consist of 41 battleships, 20 armored cruisers, 40 cruisers, 144 destroyers, 72 submarines.

<sup>4</sup> \$78,837,569 authorized to be expended from 1911 to 1917 for the construction of war vessels.

<sup>5</sup> Russian shipbuilding program provides for the completion by 1918 of 4 battle cruisers, 8 small cruisers, 36 destroyers, and 18 submarines.

The following vessels are not included in the tables: Ships over 20 years old from date of launch, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmament within 5 years; torpedo craft over 15 years old; transports, colliers, repair ships, converted merchant vessels, or any other auxiliaries; vessels of less than 1,500 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.

NOTE.—Vessels undergoing trials are considered as completed.

#### ACTIVE PERSONNEL.

Rank.	England.	Germany.	United States.	France.	Japan.	Russia.	Italy.	Austria-Hungary.
Admirals of the Fleet.....	3	2	<sup>1</sup> 1	—	2	—	—	—
Admirals.....	12	6	—	—	6	12	1	1
Vice admirals.....	22	12	—	15	19	20	10	2
Rear admirals.....	58	22	<sup>2</sup> 25	30	38	21	19	15
Captains and commanders.....	702	154	212	360	270	346	137	80
Other line officers.....	2,508	2,220	1,680	1,419	1,965	1,378	753	558
Midshipmen at sea.....	639	448	—	77	119	—	73	175
Engineer officers.....	837	577	—	505	811	538	326	164
Medical officers.....	503	340	336	<sup>3</sup> 390	<sup>4</sup> 364	286	<sup>5</sup> 259	84
Pay officers.....	750	276	231	211	388	—	228	<sup>6</sup> 224
Naval constructors.....	122	162	75	187	<sup>6</sup> 135	519	107	<sup>7</sup> 141
Chaplains.....	117	30	24	—	—	85	—	11
Warrant officers.....	2,740	3,183	867	<sup>8</sup> 147	1,509	—	1,340	387
Enlisted men.....	119,597	65,797	52,566	60,505	50,050	49,258	36,660	<sup>9</sup> 17,689
Marine officers.....	465	<sup>10</sup> 177	341	—	—	—	—	—
Enlisted men (marines).....	<sup>11</sup> 21,414	<sup>10</sup> 5,791	9,915	—	—	—	—	—
Total.....	150,609	79,197	66,273	63,846	55,736	52,463	39,913	19,531

<sup>1</sup> The Admiral of the Navy.

<sup>2</sup> The United States now has, temporarily, as extra numbers, due to promotion for war service, and to officers restricted by law to engineering duty only on shore only 6 flag officers, 20 captains, 9 commanders, 6 lieutenant commanders, and 1 lieutenant.

<sup>3</sup> Includes pharmacists.

<sup>4</sup> Includes pharmaceutical officers.

<sup>5</sup> Includes 21 officers of the Judge Advocate's Corps.

<sup>6</sup> Includes 50 ordnance and 10 hydrographic engineers.

<sup>7</sup> Includes 4 hydrographic engineers.

<sup>8</sup> Includes adjutants principaux; does not include premier maitres and maitres.

<sup>9</sup> Includes 4,000 recruits for 42 days.

<sup>10</sup> Marine infantry and seaman artillery.

<sup>11</sup> Includes 3,130 men of the coast guard.

NOTE.—In the table published December 1, 1913, the number of captains and commanders given was 356 and other line officers 1,881. This apparent discrepancy was due to the inclusion of 213 korvetten kapitane (lieutenant commanders) with the captains and commanders. In the above table the korvetten kapitane (226) are included with the other line officers. Under Italy the number of vice admirals given was 18: this was a typographical error and should have been 8.

## Warship tonnage of the principal naval powers.

NUMBER AND DISPLACEMENT OF WARSHIPS, BUILT AND BUILDING, OF 1,500 OR MORE TONS, AND OF TORPEDO CRAFT OF MORE THAN 50 TONS.

Type of vessel.	Great Britain. <sup>1</sup>				Germany.				United States. <sup>2</sup>				France.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	Num- ber.	Tons.	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons.	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons.	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons.	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).
Battleships (dreadnaught type) <sup>3</sup> ...	20	423,350	16	421,750	13	285,770	7	187,164	8	189,650	4	117,900	4	92,368	8	193,656
Battleships (predreadnaught) <sup>4</sup> ...	40	589,385			20	242,800			22	309,282			18	262,675		
Coast-defense vessels <sup>5</sup> ...					2	8,168			4	12,900			1	8,800		
Battle cruisers <sup>6</sup> ...	9	187,800	1	28,500	4	88,749	4	112,000								
Armored cruisers...	34	406,800			9	94,245			11	149,295			20	201,724		
Cruisers <sup>7</sup> ...	74	382,815	17	67,000	41	150,747	5	26,900	14	66,410			9	46,095		
Torpedo-boat destroyers...	167	125,850	21	21,770	130	67,094	24	14,400	51	35,068	11	11,956	84	35,812	3	2,653
Torpedo boats...	49	11,488							13	2,528			135	13,426		
Submarines...	75	30,362	22	17,236	27	14,140	18	14,400	30		<sup>8</sup> 19		64	27,940	22	14,766
Total tons built and total tons building.....		2,157,850		556,256		951,713		354,864		765,133		129,756		688,840		211,075
Total tons built and building.		2,714,106				1,306,577				894,889				899,915		

  

Type of vessel.	Japan.				Russia.				Italy.				Austria-Hungary.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	Num- ber.	Tons.	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).	Num- ber.	Tons (es- timated).
Battleships (dreadnaught type) <sup>3</sup> ...	2	41,600	4	122,400			7	150,409	3	62,644	7	187,150	3	60,030	4	93,510
Battleships (predreadnaught) <sup>4</sup> ...	13	191,380			7	98,750			8	96,100			6	74,613		
Coast-defense vessels <sup>5</sup> ...	2	9,086			2	10,380							6	41,700		
Battle cruisers <sup>6</sup> ...	2	55,000	2	55,000			4	128,000								
Armored cruisers...	13	138,483			6	63,500			9	74,020			2	13,380		
Cruisers <sup>7</sup> ...	13	57,915			9	52,845	8	53,600	6	18,830	2	4,888	5	13,815	5	21,216
Torpedo-boat destroyers...	50	20,487	2	1,676	91	36,748	44	53,664	36	16,807	15	14,203	18	9,450		
Torpedo boats...	27	3,017			14	2,132			68	11,584	2	272	39	6,852	24	5,886
Submarines...	13	2,672	2	1,200	30	6,506	19	13,284	19	5,475	8	5,842	6	1,688	6	5,370
Total tons built and total tons building.....		519,640		180,276		270,861		407,957		285,460		212,355		221,526		125,982
Total tons built and build- ing.....		699,916				678,818				497,815				347,503		

<sup>1</sup> Colonial vessels included.<sup>2</sup> Does not include Idaho and Mississippi, recently sold, or ships of current program for which contracts have not been awarded.<sup>3</sup> Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).<sup>4</sup> Battleships of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement, whose main batteries are of more than one caliber.<sup>5</sup> Includes smaller battleships and monitors.<sup>6</sup> Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection.<sup>7</sup> All unarmored warships of more than 1,500 tons are classed as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.<sup>8</sup> Includes 3 submarines authorized in 1913; contract for fourth not yet awarded.

The following vessels are not included in the tables: Ships over 20 years old from date of launch, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmored within 5 years; torpedo craft over 15 years old; those not actually begun or ordered, although authorized; transports, colliers, repair ships, torpedo depot ships, or other auxiliaries; vessels of less than 1,500 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.

NOTE.—Vessels undergoing trials are considered as completed.

## RELATIVE ORDER OF WARSHIP TONNAGE.

Present order (tonnage completed).		As would be the case if vessels now building were completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain.....	2,157,850	Great Britain.....	2,714,106
Germany.....	951,713	Germany.....	1,306,577
United States.....	765,133	France.....	899,915
France.....	688,840	United States.....	894,889
Japan.....	519,640	Japan.....	699,916
Italy.....	285,460	Russia.....	678,818
Russia.....	270,861	Italy.....	497,815
Austria-Hungary.....	221,526	Austria.....	347,503

I shall not enter upon any minute examination of the figures given in these tables, for anyone who will take the trouble to look at them can easily make the comparisons himself. It will be seen that the United States has 8 dreadnaughts and 22 battleships, some of the latter of old types which have been reconstructed and rearmored. Of the highest type battleship, the dreadnaught, we have only 8. We ought to have at least 48 dreadnaughts and battleships instead of 30 if we would properly defend our coast. The actual situation of the fleet as it relates to battleships at the present time is as follows:

(a) Effective battleships completed and ready for service, less than 20 years old from completion (since the sale of the <i>Mississippi</i> and <i>Idaho</i> ).....	30
(b) Battleships under construction.....	4
(c) Battleships authorized in 1914.....	2
(d) To replace <i>Mississippi</i> and <i>Idaho</i> .....	1
Total.....	37

This shows that we are now deficient 10 battleships, built, building, and authorized, from the number contemplated in the 1903 program of the General Board of the Navy. In consider-



ing these figures, however, it is well to remember that they include old ships and ships out of commission. It is true that every navy includes in its figures old ships not up to the latest modern requirement. Out of our 30 completed battleships, however, as well as I can make out from the information available, there are 12 which would require months of work to get them in order, because they have been laid up owing to the fact that we have not had the men and the crews to put on board of them; that is, we really have out of the 30 ships given in the table only 18 that are first-rate modern ships. You will see from these tables that the United States has four dreadnaughts building or authorized and no battle cruisers. We need more destroyers, but our most obvious weakness is in submarines. These tables show that we have 30 submarines built and 19 building or authorized; but these figures are misleading, and I wish to call your attention to the testimony of Commander Stirling before the House committee. From this testimony it appears, as nearly as I can make out, that we actually have 38 submarines built, 11 building, and 8 authorized, making in all 57. How many of those are good for anything, I do not know. I have studied the testimony, but it is very confusing. Let me, however, read what Commander Stirling said in regard to the mobilization of the Atlantic submarine flotilla (pp. 866-867) and that will give the Senate an idea of our submarine fleet.

Commander STIRLING. The commander in chief ordered a mobilization of the Atlantic submarine flotilla at Hampton Roads on the 1st of November of all available vessels. He left it to me to say what vessels I would bring down there. He did not consider the 5 at Colon. That reduced the submarine flotilla to 12.

Two of the 12 had but recently been turned over by the contractors. Their officers and men were new, and the boats had not been given their torpedoes; they had not left the navy yard. So I excluded them. That left 10, and 2 of them had been ordered by the Navy Department to have necessary alterations made on them at the contractor's yard at Groton.

If the contractors had been ready to do the work, and if the department had held those boats up and sent them to Hampton Roads, they were perfectly able to go there and would have been efficient, but it would have cost the Government a good deal of money by holding up the contractors. That left 8.

Of the 8, one of them had, after a submerged run, developed salt water in the battery. It was sent to the navy yard, and they were reconstructing the battery tank, and at the time of the mobilization the alterations had not been completed; and that left 7.

The G-4 had only been in operation a few weeks, and had only joined the flotilla a couple of weeks before that—about 10 days before the order came—and I considered that her best duty would be to train herself in submerged running, and that the best locality to do that was where she could base on some vessel that could look out for her crews more or less, and so I gave her the *McDonough*, an old destroyer, and based her on New London, and she went out two or three times a day and got in good shape. That left only 6.

Mr. ROBERTS. The G-4 was the Lorenti boat?

Commander STIRLING. The G-4 was the Lorenti boat.

Mr. ROBERTS. You say her batteries are too weak for underwater running?

Commander STIRLING. No; but batteries are defective. That left 6. Two of those were the G boats, under alteration and in reserve. So that left only 4.

So I took the four submarines from Newport to the mobilization, and one tender, the *Tonopah*. When we left Newport the condition of the submarines was this: There were two boats in good shape in every way. There were two other boats with negligible battery capacity. They could submerge for 10 or 15 minutes only. Their batteries were dead. They were 4 years old.

Mr. ROBERTS. They were old batteries?

Commander STIRLING. Yes. So when we got down there the admiral wanted to know what we could do. I told him we had then only one submarine that I thought could efficiently take part in the maneuvers at sea off the coast. One that had been in good condition when we left broke a crank shaft on the way down and burned out a motor bearing, requiring about three days' repair at the navy yard, or by tender, if we had one to do the work. In the latter case the work would probably have been done in less time.

Mr. ROBERTS. You had a tender?

Commander STIRLING. But she did not have the facilities.

Mr. ROBERTS. She had no facilities for such repairs?

Commander STIRLING. She had no facilities for such repairs. One boat had a half battery and could have submerged for probably three hours at slow speed, and was able, in every way, with a trained crew, to take part in short maneuvers. That was reported to the commander in chief, and the commander in chief reported that to our Navy Department.

Mr. ROBERTS. Then the heading of the article is somewhat misleading when it says only 1 out of 17 will dive.

Commander STIRLING. That is misleading, because it seems to imply that the 17 were all to be in service and only 1 was able to dive, while, as a matter of fact, all but 4 were undergoing alterations and necessary repairs or were stationed at Colon. The 5 stationed at Colon were all ready.

The CHAIRMAN. Those were all right, subject to this periodical repair work and the accidental repairs you mentioned?

Commander STIRLING. Yes, sir. The K boats. As I said, in time of emergency I would not have hesitated to have said that, while they had not demonstrated their ability to do what is required of them, but this is war, and we will go ahead, even with crews that have not been completely trained. Even under those circumstances we would have gone out against an enemy with the four K boats.

The CHAIRMAN. They were new boats and had just been delivered, and they had not had any training?

Commander STIRLING. Yes, sir; that is partly correct. They were perfectly excusable in every way, as far as the Navy is concerned. The engines are not yet satisfactory.

Mr. HOBSON. Captain, after your experience with flotillas and submarine boats, what types would you recommend for us to adopt this

year and during the coming year when making appropriations for this purpose? About what size boat would you recommend?

Commander STIRLING. I understand the General Board has gone into that question very exhaustively and has recommended two types, the sea-going submarine and the coast submarine. When I was there the other day a number of the junior officers questioned me in regard to that matter and asked me what I considered was the minimum size for the coast-defense type from my experience in the flotilla—and I want to say my experience in the flotilla has not been very long. I take my experience from the officers there. Everything we do in the flotilla, every decision we make, is the consensus of opinion of all the commanding officers we can get together. We lay the questions before them and get the views from them, and from these views we make up the consensus of opinion, and the consensus of opinion of the Atlantic submarine flotilla is that the smallest submarine that should be built should not be smaller than about 500 tons submerged displacement.

It may also be added that the torpedoes we now have are all lightly built, and that our submarines are not only deficient in torpedoes but in size. Germany, England, and France have 800 and 1,000 ton submarines (p. 843), and we know what work they have done. The truth is we are sadly deficient in submarines; we have scarcely any really effective ones, none large enough for present conditions, and the figures that are given in the tables are, on their face, entirely misleading as to the actual value of our submarine fleet.

Our worst deficiency, however, even worse than in the case of submarines, is in scout cruisers. In the table which I have given the number of cruisers is put at 14, but that includes vessels of different types; and, as a matter of fact, I believe we have only three scout cruisers, as against 74 in England, 41 in Germany, and 13 in Japan. The scout cruisers which we have were authorized in 1904, and I wish to call attention to the statement of the General Board on this point:

In the struggle to build up the purely distinctive fighting ships of the Navy—battleships, destroyers, and submarines—the cruising and scouting element of the fleet has been neglected in recent years, and no cruisers or scouts have been provided for since 1904, when the *Montana*, *North Carolina*, *Birmingham*, *Chester*, and *Salem* were authorized. This leaves the fleet peculiarly lacking in this element so necessary for information in a naval campaign, and of such great value in clearing the sea of torpedo and mining craft, in opening and protecting routes of trade for our own commerce, and in closing and prohibiting such routes to the commerce of the enemy. The General Board believes that this branch of the fleet has been too long neglected and recommends that the construction of this important and necessary type be resumed. For the 1916 program it is recommended that four scout cruisers be provided.

We have three scout cruisers, therefore, to protect and give warning of the approach of a hostile fleet for 6,000 miles of coast on the Atlantic and Pacific. If they were all concentrated on the Atlantic coast, they would have to cover 1,000 miles a day to patrol the coast, and they are slow ships. They ought to be of the highest possible speed—30 to 31 knots per hour.

In sea strength, both in vessels built and building or authorized, we occupy third place among the nations; but when we come to tonnage, which is the great test, you will observe by the tables which I print that we have dropped to fourth place among the world navies, counting the vessels now building. We have not only dropped to fourth place in tonnage, but we have come dangerously near to Japan, which occupies fifth place.

Now, I ask attention to the active personnel of the Navy, taken from the same authority—the Office of Naval Intelligence—on July 1, 1914. According to this table we have 66,273 officers and men comprising the active personnel of the Navy. But this again is somewhat misleading, as to our naval efficiency as connected with the personnel. On this point the testimony of Mr. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, merits attention. It appears from his evidence that we are 18,000 men short of the number of men that we ought to have in time of peace as a preparation for war, and we shall be 4,000 more short if we count those necessary to man the vessels coming into commission in 1915 and 1916. These facts are also stated in the testimony of Admiral Badger before the House committee (p. 482). This shortage of men not only shows that our fleet is unprepared for war and for a sudden exigency of national defense but it also brings with it the deterioration of the ships laid up and out of commission, because we have not the men to put on board of them. Surely it is not necessary to dwell further upon such a condition as this.

I wish now to say a word about a new element in warfare which concerns both services and which has proved, in the war in Europe, to be of very great importance, if not as a military instrument, as a valuable means of obtaining information, both for armies and fleets. I refer, of course, to what are generally called air craft, or, more specifically, aeroplanes and hydroplanes. I do not think any argument is necessary to demonstrate the importance of the aeroplane in war. I merely wish to call attention to the condition of our two services in that respect. In the Army we have at this moment 13 aeroplanes and no Zeppelins or dirigible airships. We have no armored aeroplanes and no guns suitable for aeroplanes. In view of what we have all learned from the war in Europe, it seems to me



that this is a deplorable condition, no matter to what cause it is due. In the Navy we have 12 aeroplanes and no Zeppelins or dirigible airships, according to the report of the General Board. The money appropriated for this branch of the service in the Navy, I am informed, has not been expended, and it is stated that the delay has been owing to the failure of the American manufacturers to furnish aeroplanes, to the differences of the experts as to the best type, and to the fact that we are waiting to get some aeroplanes from abroad in order to test them. These are, no doubt, correct explanations, but they are no defense of the conditions. No matter what the reasons may be for our lack of aeroplanes in both services, the deficiency ought to be supplied. If the manufacturers can not make them, then we should make them ourselves. In the country where the Langley formula, upon which all aeroplanes are built, was first established, in the country where the heavier-than-air machine was first perfected and successfully flown, it seems to me idle to suppose that we can not build good aeroplanes. It is quite possible that the nations now fighting in Europe have not got the best conceivable type of aeroplanes, but they have large numbers of them, which are formidable, and effective, and which seem to answer every purpose. And if they have them we can have them. Congress has not been illiberal in making appropriations in this direction, and ought to continue to do so. It ought also to give to both Secretaries authority to enlist mechanics or drivers, who can go up with the officers in charge and run the machinery. Men fit for this work can be had if you pay them enough. You can not get them for the pay of a sailor or a soldier, and the Secretaries of War and Navy ought to be given authority to employ such men at a rate of pay which is sufficient to get the best, leaving the rate to the discretion of the two Secretaries. We ought also to make it plain that what Congress and the people want is a sufficient number of aeroplanes to serve and protect their Army and Navy. An army and navy without aeroplanes, as we practically are to-day, would be helpless, indeed, in the face of an enemy provided with them. In this connection let me quote what is said on this point by the General Board of the Navy:

24. The General Board in its indorsement No. 449 of August 30, 1913, and accompanying memorandum brought to the attention of the department the dangerous situation of the country in the lack of air craft and air men in both the naval and military services. A résumé was given in that indorsement with the accompanying memorandum of conditions in the leading countries abroad at that date, showing the preparations being made for air warfare and the use of air craft by both armies and navies, and contrasting their activity with our own inactivity. Certain recommendations were made in the same indorsement looking to the beginning of the establishment of a proper air service for the Navy.

25. The total result of that effort was the appointment of a board on aeronautics October 9, 1913. That board made further recommendations, among them the establishment of an aeronautics school and station at Pensacola and the purchase of 50 aeroplanes, 1 fleet dirigible, and 2 small dirigibles for training. At the present time, more than a year later, the total number of air craft of any kind owned by the Navy consists of 12 aeroplanes, not more than 2 of which are of the same type, and all reported to have too little speed and carrying capacity for service work.

26. In view of the advance that has been made in aeronautics during the past year, and the demonstration now being made of the vital importance of a proper air service to both land and sea warfare, our present situation can be described as nothing less than deplorable. As now developed air craft are the eyes of both armies and navies, and it is difficult to place any limit to their offensive possibilities.

27. In our present condition of unpreparedness, in contact with any foe possessing a proper air service, our scouting would be blind. We would be without the means of detecting the presence of submarines or mine fields or of attempting direct attack on the enemy from the air, while our own movements would be an open book to him. The General Board can not too strongly urge that the department's most serious thought be given to this matter, and that immediate steps be taken to remedy it, and recommends that Congress be asked for an appropriation of at least \$5,000,000, to be made available immediately, for the purpose of establishing an efficient air service.

I will now take from the testimony of Capt. Bristol before the House committee, page 299, a statement which shows the equipment of other nations in respect to dirigibles and aeroplanes:

Capt. BRISTOL. At the beginning of this war our best information gave, approximately, France 22 dirigibles and 1,400 aeroplanes; Russia, 18 dirigibles and 800 aeroplanes; Great Britain, 9 dirigibles and 400 aeroplanes; Belgium, 2 dirigibles and 100 aeroplanes; Serbia, 60 aeroplanes; Germany, 40 dirigibles and 1,000 aeroplanes; Austria, 8 dirigibles and 400 aeroplanes; and the United States, 23 aeroplanes.

It seems to me that this is a melancholy showing, and to be met with the answer that we have not yet been able to decide on the best possible type of aeroplane or of armored aeroplane is deplorable. The aeroplanes of Europe have been good enough to do very effective service, and surely it is better to have machines that can do something than to have no machines at all. According to the testimony of Secretary Daniels, page 711, we have a total of 77 men in the aeronautic service of the Navy. What a splendid and effective force this would be if we were attacked by a foreign fleet!

Thus I have shown, as it seems to me, in the statements just made that our national defense is not only imperfect and unbalanced but that it has grave and in some instances fatal deficiencies. I have made no allegations drawn merely from my personal beliefs. I have simply stated facts as given by official authority, and I think that those facts tell their own story. My only purpose has been to show by the facts the deficiencies in our means of national defense. I have no intention of attempting to set forth in detail the proper remedies to be applied. That must be the work of experts and of the men who devote their attention to the subject. To obtain the proper remedies we ought to have, as I have already said, a commission, or, better still, a permanent council of national defense in which the legislative and executive branches of the Government should both be represented. We should also have a general staff both in the Army and the Navy who can furnish the council of national defense and Congress with the expert knowledge necessary to reach right conclusions. Generally speaking, it is clear to my mind that the Regular Army, whether large or small, should be properly balanced and proportioned as well as thoroughly equipped. Our Army to-day is neither properly balanced, properly proportioned, nor properly equipped. No matter how small the military machine may be, and I am far from desiring a large one, it should be as nearly as possible a perfect machine. Ours is not. It is also clear that we have no reserves to draw upon for the support of the Regular Army in case of war. These reserves should be created. No one would think of suggesting either conscription or compulsory service for this purpose, but the end can be obtained without either. The volunteer camps where the men are now paying all their own expenses prove to my mind that, if the Government should pay reserve volunteers for their month's service and give them their equipment and their transportation, there would be no difficulty in obtaining them. I believe that the scheme so ably elaborated by my colleague in this direction would be entirely successful. I do not believe that virility, patriotism, and courage are so dead in the United States or so narcotized by commercialism and the talk of professional peace advocates that we could not get 500,000 young men, or five times that number, under proper conditions to make themselves fit and ready to come to the defense of the country whenever the country was attacked. What I have said of the Regular Army is true of the militia. It is unbalanced, it is insufficiently equipped, it requires the careful and liberal attention of Congress.

What I have just said of the Army is also true of the Navy. It is strong in certain directions and very weak in others. In some important particulars it has little or no equipment. It should be made as perfect and as well balanced as possible. To secure these results in both services we must have unity of action. We can not succeed in doing so if we do not establish some means of dealing with the great subject of defense as a whole. When that is done the rest will follow.

I learned in college when studying political economy that Adam Smith thought that defense was more important than opulence, that the first duty of a sovereign was the protection of the country against invasion, and that "an industrious nation and, upon that account, a wealthy nation, is, of all others, the most likely to be attacked." (Wealth of Nations, Book V, ch. 1.) These teachings, at least, I have never forgotten.

I know well that all this will cost money, but I am old-fashioned enough to believe thoroughly in the doctrine in which I was brought up as a boy, the doctrine declared by Charles Cotesworth Pinckney when we were a poor and struggling Nation, that we have "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." I want an adequate national defense, and, speaking broadly, I care little what it costs if we can obtain it. Were it possible in the present state of human nature in the United States we could obtain this adequate national defense without additional expenditure. Cut off our needless Army posts, cut off our needless navy yards and stations. Lay aside for a few years appropriations for public buildings and river and harbor improvements where they are not needed by the public at large. Drop off all the expenditures which are designed for spots where votes are lying thickest, and you will have money enough to provide for a sufficient Army and an adequate Navy without adding to the burden of taxation. This is perhaps a counsel of perfection. I have put it forward simply to show that if Congress has the vigor of character necessary for such self-denying ordinances it can provide for our national defense out of existing revenue. But whether it does this or not, the national defense ought to be provided for, no matter what the cost. I believe this is the wish of the American people to-day, and that the intensity of their desire will increase as they become familiar with existing conditions. The American people, in my opinion, understand well that a sufficient national defense does not imply



war, but is an assurance against war. They are not misled by the parrot cry that preparedness brings war. All through history there have been nations or States which have armed themselves for conquest, and their preparedness meant war because war was the object; but to say that the mere fact of readiness to defend one's self means war is absurd. It would be as reasonable to say that the Civil War in the United States came because both sides were unprepared as to assert that war comes because a nation is ready to defend itself against aggression. There is no thought of conquest in the hearts of the American people. We wish for nothing but peace at home and abroad. Every reflecting man must favor a general reduction of armaments, but there is no such incitement to war possible as for a rich and prosperous nation, whether great or small, to disarm alone and remain unarmed in the midst of an armed world. We do not want war with any nation or any people, and the way to avoid war is not to invite it. Unarmed, unready, undefended, we offer a standing invitation to aggression and attack, and the idea, still popular or used for purposes of oratory by some people, that we can meet all dangers by springing to arms when the moment comes, is a dream so wild that it would be grotesque if it were not tragic. In these days of rapid movement and swift communication what possible defense could be offered to a military machine, organized to the highest point of efficiency, by an untrained people springing to arms which they have not got? The ocean barrier which defended us in 1776 and 1812 no longer exists. Steam and electricity have destroyed it. What we should aim at is to make it plain to all the world that we seek no conquest, that we desire only peace, and that to preserve our own peace we have a defense so strong that no nation in the world could hope for aught but loss and disaster in attacking us.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not present to listen to the entire address of the Senator from Massachusetts, and he may have stated what I desire to ask him, and that is, whether he has included in his remarks a statement showing the relation which our appropriations for military and naval purposes bear to similar appropriations by the great powers of the world.

Mr. LODGE. No; I have made no comparison between our appropriations and those of other powers, but I have compared our appropriations for defense in case of the Navy with the total property of the country.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I heard that, but it was the other matter to which I referred.

Mr. LODGE. No; I have made no comparison with the appropriations of other nations.

I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 19422, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in view of the discussion had on yesterday concerning the site of the Eastern High School I have two letters which I think it is but proper should be placed in the RECORD. They are brief, and if the Senator in charge of the bill will permit me the privilege I will read the letters myself.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I offer no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. The first letter is from Henry P. Blair, president of the board of education. Mr. Blair writes:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 15, 1915.

Hon. J. H. GALLINGER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GALLINGER: In reading yesterday's debate in the Senate regarding the Eastern High School site two questions are suggested which I wish entirely clear for your information, particularly in view of the patient consideration which this proposition has received during the many years of agitation before the purchase was authorized.

The location selected is the nearest to present and prospective center of school population available. The sites committee, superintendent, and myself, being all the male members of the board, spent an entire half day in personal inspection of the four sites formally submitted to the commissioners, as well as land possible to be purchased within the limits of the appropriation of adequate area for this school site. A hearing two hours in length was given, at which Dr. Emmons, Capt. Potter, and Mr. S. W. Curriden strongly urged the jail site, one of the gentlemen named even urging that the erection of the school should be immediately started on ground available on the jail site between the buildings heretofore used for the male and female work-houses before the latter were removed. The sites committee gave

careful and long consideration to the final choice, and the site selected was by unanimous vote when deliberations were concluded.

A more desirable location would have been to the north and west of the present site, but no sufficient unimproved area was to be found, and the value of the improved areas was far beyond the sum appropriated, if sufficient land was to be had for the proper present and prospective needs of the school. All the protests have come from organizations located in the southeastern part of the city, who either do not know or are unwilling to recognize the gradual movement of the school center of population in east Washington toward the north. With the reclamation of the Anacostia River and growth of the city the bulk of territorial area to be served will in the future lie northerly and easterly from the site selected.

It is only just to add that no member of the board owns a foot of ground within the area of the site selected, and that Mr. Larnier personally was inclined at first toward another site, but yielded his judgment in the matter to the views of the majority of the committee and united in the unanimous selection. It is possible that he is a trustee under some deed of trust securing money loaned on property within the area of the squares selected, although I have not had time to have the records examined. If the fact be so, it would give no substantial interest to him in the selection of the site, as all loans by our trust companies are carefully margined at 60 per cent or less of the market value of the property used as security. It would not represent in the usual course of business any personal investment, and does not in this instance, as Mr. Larnier has informed me, nor has he any personal interest in any property in the eastern section of the city.

Your personal kindness to me is deeply appreciated, as well as the genuine sympathetic interest which Senator SMITH has shown in this important project.

Sincerely, yours,

HENRY P. BLAIR.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I understand Mr. Blair is the president of the board of education.

Mr. GALLINGER. He is the president of the board of education.

A moment ago a letter from Mr. Larnier was handed to me at my desk. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 15, 1915.

Hon. J. H. GALLINGER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GALLINGER: Mr. Henry P. Blair has called my attention to certain statements which were made on the floor of the Senate in reference to the property selected by the board of education and the District Commissioners as a site for the new Eastern High School. He has also called my attention to a statement which was made, which is in effect that I was either interested personally or as trustee in certain lots located within the boundaries of the squares selected for this building.

My purpose in writing you is to say that I have no personal interest in any property located within the lines of this site or any personal interest whatever in any properties located in that immediate section of the city. I wish also to say that I have no knowledge of any property within the boundaries aforesaid being in my name as trustee of any character.

When the matter was first mentioned to me I thought it was possible that I might be a trustee under a deed of trust to secure a loan to the Washington Loan & Trust Co., for which company I am counsel and for which I have frequently acted under deeds of trust to secure loans. In order to verify this matter I have caused the real estate officer of the Washington Loan & Trust Co. to investigate the books of the company, that he might find if that institution had any money loaned upon properties embraced within the proposed site. I am just now informed that the Washington Loan & Trust Co. has at this time no loans upon any property within those squares.

The statement, therefore, that I am interested as a trustee for the Washington Loan & Trust Co. or that the trust company has loans upon lots in these blocks appears to be untrue.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN B. LARNER.

Mr. President, this illustrates how easy it is for a rumor to be started or for an accusation to be made which appears in our debates in the Senate, but which has no foundation in fact.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, is there any amendment pending? I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending, on which the Chair does not know whether the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is going to withdraw his point of order or not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Sherman
Brady	Gallinger	Norris	Simmons
Brandagee	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Snoot
Bryan	Hollis	Oliver	Sterling
Burleigh	Hughes	Overman	Stone
Barton	James	Owen	Thomas
Camden	Johnson	Page	Thornton
Chamberlain	Jones	Perkins	Tillman
Chilton	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Poindexter	Vardaman
Colt	La Follette	Pomerene	White
Culberson	Lane	Reed	Williams
Cummins	Lee, Tenn.	Saulsbury	
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	
du Pont	Lippitt	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have just come into the Senate Chamber. I am informed that the matter immediately pending is the point of order I made, just on the eve of adjournment



yesterday, against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will say that I personally have no objection to the amendment itself, and I will withdraw my point of order, if I may, and will not object to the amendment being voted upon with the understanding, and I state it in that form, that it is done by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The motion of Mr. SHEPPARD to agree to the report of the Committee on Rules as made by Mr. OVERMAN, January 12, 1915, to suspend paragraph 3, of Rule XVI.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to discuss this motion, if in order now.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas if he is willing to lay it aside temporarily until we dispose of the other amendments? I have one to offer, and, as far as I know, that is the only amendment yet to be offered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am entirely willing to lay it aside for the remaining amendments to be considered.

Mr. LANE. I have one amendment to offer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Senator will ask unanimous consent, I shall not object to laying aside the motion temporarily.

Mr. POMERENE. As the amendment pending is the one introduced by myself—

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I object to laying aside the motion. We might just as well decide it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on agreeing to the report of the committee.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I notice the report of the committee refers to the consideration of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas and all amendments thereto. I make the inquiry as to whether the report as phrased would permit amendments in case the Senate should agree to the consideration thereof under the report of the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There can be no doubt about the state of the record. The Senator from Texas gave notice, and had it referred subsequently to the Committee on Rules, of a motion to suspend the rule of the Senate which provides that no amendment proposing general legislation shall be presented to an appropriation bill. That is not the exact language but the substance of it. The Committee on Rules reported favorably that the rule should be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Texas to present an amendment involving general legislation to an appropriation bill. A point of order was then raised as to whether the rule could be set aside by a majority or whether it took two-thirds of the Senate to temporarily suspend it. The Chair referred that point of order to the Senate. The Senate decided that it takes a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules.

There is nothing before the Senate except to vote upon the question as to whether the rule will be suspended. If carried by a two-thirds vote, the rule is suspended. Thereupon the Senator from Texas can present his amendment, and that amendment, like all other amendments, is subject to further amendment at the instance of any Senator.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is clearly understood that the amendment of the Senator from Texas, if coming before the Senate, would be subject to amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has tried to so state.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I wish to have it clearly understood that in the event I should vote to support the committee's report and to bring the amendment of the Senator from Texas before the Senate, I would do so with the expectation of being able to sustain or support other amendments, including among them a referendum to the people of the community to be affected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to submit a few remarks on this subject. I shall not detain the Senate very long.

Nearly 13 years ago Congress prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors in this Capitol Building. Its action met with universal applause, and to-day there is no suggestion from any quarter for a return to the old practice. The extension of that prohibition to the capital city and the capital district would meet with equal applause, and after so proper, so logical, and so humanitarian a step shall have been taken not a whisper will arise for its reversal.

The District of Columbia is peculiarly the property of the Nation. It is the ambition of all American citizens to make

Washington the model city of the world. How shameful it must appear to them that within their Capital City, a city that should be the head and front of all that is pure and decent and ennobling, there are 300 saloons, or 1 to about every 233 adult males. A convivial individual a few years ago on leaving the Capitol met a tourist near the Capitol steps. The tourist accosted him and said, "Mister, how far is it from the Capitol to the White House?" "Stranger," replied the individual questioned, "it is 17 blocks and 26 saloons."

It is said that the Nation has no right to impose prohibition on the District of Columbia. What peculiar virtue does the liquor traffic possess that its abolition must be made the subject of a referendum when every other question is within the absolute control of Congress? The people of this Republic pay for the expense of maintaining the District of Columbia, of educating the children, of paving the streets, of supporting the courts, the hospitals, the jails. Besides, they have a patriotic interest in making it the Nation's pride.

Internal conditions here are not local in the sense that they are local in any self-governing Commonwealth in the Union. The Federal District was created for the especial purpose of Federal control, and the people who live here came to the District with that understanding; they live here to-day with that understanding.

The idea of a referendum was a mere second thought, and a poor second thought at that. It did not occur to its proponents when I introduced the motion to suspend the rules last Monday. They thought it would never see the light of day. It did not occur to them to propose a referendum when the next day my motion was referred to the Committee on Rules. They thought it would be consigned there to the senatorial potter's field. But when the Committee on Rules reported the motion out with a haste that violated the senatorial speed limit it then suddenly occurred to these gentlemen who are opposed to the motion that the citizens of the District of Columbia are possessed of some rights. It was only when they were brought face to face with the fact that the liquor traffic was threatened with extermination in the District of Columbia that they became so aroused along the line of self-government in the District. They then engineered a movement by which the Senate determined that my motion would require a two-thirds vote—a direct and inexcusable violation, in my opinion, of the plain import of the rule I had invoked. These gentlemen are loudly protesting their loyalty to the idea of a referendum, yet not one of them is in favor of referring the Nation-wide prohibition amendment to the States of this Union for decision, despite the fact that the States are the constitutional tribunal with exclusive authority for this purpose.

When it is in the interest of the liquor traffic to have a referendum they want a referendum. When it is not in the interest of the liquor traffic to have a referendum they do not want it. They are against a referendum for the Nation-wide amendment, although the Nation-wide amendment in itself invokes one of the highest rights the States of this Union possess, namely, the right to mold the character of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, the traffic in alcoholic liquor is a trade in the most seductive and powerful poison that men to their sorrow have ever known. Louis Pasteur, one of the foremost of all scientists, a man who achieved an everlasting reputation through his investigations into the character of ferments, has this to say:

Another equally exceptional characteristic of yeast and fermentation in general consists in the small proportion which the yeast that forms bears to the sugar that decomposes. In all other known beings the weight of nutritive matter assimilated corresponds with the weight of food used up, any difference that may exist being comparatively small. The life of yeast is entirely different. For a certain weight of yeast formed we may have ten times, twenty times, a hundred times as much sugar, or even more, decomposed, as we shall experimentally prove by and by; that is to say, that whilst the proportion varies in a precise manner, according to conditions which we shall have occasion to specify, it is also greatly out of proportion to the weight of the yeast. We repeat, the life of no other being under its normal physiological conditions can show anything similar. The alcoholic ferments, therefore, present themselves to us as plants which possess at least two singular properties: They can live without air—that is, without oxygen—and they can cause decomposition to an amount which, though variable, yet, as estimated by weight of product formed, is out of all proportion to the weight of their own substance.

Thus, Mr. President, this substance, this organism, is the only one that in return for nutriment produces decomposition and that in return for the means of life gives death. As its origin is in one of the most intense rotting processes known to organic life, so it rots everything with which it comes in contact. Its chief mission is to wreck and to damn. It enslaves body, mind, and soul. Its hold is so pitiless and so complete that few of its victims ever escape.



The loss to society, economic and moral, from the ravages of this drug is such that the only effective measures are preventive ones. The hereditary alcoholic taint transmitted from even moderate drinkers to children still unborn, condemning many of them to deformity, to lunacy, to epilepsy, to blindness, to disease, to the fatal appetites of their fathers, to children who are thus deprived of the right of normal birth, forms an additional reason for the extermination of the traffic.

Already the drink bill of the Nation is reaching a yearly total of \$2,500,000,000, more than half the cost to the United States of the entire Civil War. The Republic can not endure with this cancer in its vitals.

Chauncey M. Depew, the eloquent and able octogenarian, a man who at the age of 80 retains his brilliant intellectual powers, delivered a speech within the last few months at Ossining, N. Y., celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of that place. He was giving reminiscences of his early days, and he had this to say incidentally:

When I first ran for the lower house of our New York Legislature 52 years ago, I was told that unless I secured the support of one of your most active citizens, an eccentric and successful man, I could not be elected. I addressed a meeting in the public square, and afterwards this gentleman insisted upon adjourning to the American House for refreshments. At that time temperance was unknown. It was an insult to refuse a drink. Most of the public men whom I met in the legislature died from alcoholism.

This was an incidental but vivid revelation of the havoc this poison has been wreaking. Men say that their personal liberty will be interfered with by the prohibition of intoxicating liquors. I tell you that your personal liberty is subject to the right of society to abolish a traffic which is the chief source of poverty and of crime. The good of the thousands this traffic transforms into murderers, thieves, lunatics, paupers, beasts, is superior to your right to walk into a saloon, lean upon a mahogany bar, and solemnly discuss your personal liberty.

You say you can not legislate morality into men. That is true; but it is also true that you can legislate certain concrete temptations out of the pathway of humanity. The removal of saloons will put intoxicating liquor beyond the reach of millions, to their lasting redemption and the redemption of society.

You talk about the right to drink alcoholic poison. The railroad companies do not recognize such a right. An employee who is known to drink or to frequent a saloon will be immediately dismissed. Great steel plants deny such a right. In many of them employees are warned against drink and dismissed if they are found to drink. The surety companies, in ascertaining the standing of those for whom they are asked to be responsible, always make the inquiry, Is he addicted to drink?

In fact, Mr. President, the whole world is going dry. The business world is going dry in so far as the requisites for employment are concerned. Certainly prohibition would be a logical step for our Government to adopt as to our Capital City, where the business of the Nation is principally transacted.

Preventive measures are now the order of the day. Society is beginning to see the folly of maintaining hospitals and jails and penitentiaries on the one hand and tolerating a traffic that fills them on the other.

We are beginning to see that we must go to the source of evils if we would avoid wrestling forever with their sinister results.

This amendment is merely a step in the sanitation of the Capital City. The saloon must follow the disreputable alley.

Mr. President, Gladstone said that the evils of drunkenness outweighed the evils of war, pestilence, and famine put together.

Lincoln said that after the destruction of slavery the next great problem would be the destruction of the liquor traffic, and he said he would hail that day the happiest of history when there should be neither slave nor drunkard in the world.

The man who to-day votes against the abolition of the liquor traffic in the Capital City is not voting as Abraham Lincoln would vote. In fact, he will repudiate Lincoln's memory.

Russia has already abolished the sale of vodka through its vast dominions, and the results are most gratifying. They are reflected already in the increased happiness, health, and prosperity of its people.

The Senate will put itself in touch with the highest and noblest sentiment of the age by the adoption of this amendment. It will make this Capital what it should be—a model and a light for all the world. The American people have a right to say that the liquor traffic shall not exist within their Capital. It is an insult to the Nation and a reproach to the flag. The Senate will win the approval of the Republic and of the most enlightened sentiment of the globe when it expels this curse from the Federal District.

Senators, if the mothers of this Republic could vote to-day, they would vote to expel the liquor traffic from the Capital of the Nation. If the mothers of the District could vote to-day, they would vote to drive this evil from the Capital City. Will you listen to their prayers?

The bravest battle that ever was fought,  
Shall I tell you where and when?  
On the maps of the world you'll find it not;  
'Twas fought by the mothers of men.

Nay, not with cannon or battle shot,  
With sword or nobler pen;  
Nay, not with eloquent words or thought,  
From mouths of wonderful men.

But deep in a walled-up woman's heart—  
Of woman that would not yield,  
But bravely, silently bore her part—  
Lo! there was the battle field.

No marshaling troop, no bivouac song,  
No banners to gleam and wave;  
But oh! these battles, they last so long,  
From babyhood to the grave.

Yet faithful still as a bridge of stars,  
She fights in her walled-up town—  
Fights on and in the endless wars,  
Then silent, unseen—goes down.

Oh, ye with banners and battle shot,  
And soldiers to shout and praise,  
I tell you the kingliest victories fought  
Were fought in these silent ways.

Oh, spotless woman in a world of shame!  
With a splendid and silent scorn,  
Go back to God as white as you came,  
The kingliest warrior born.

All that we ask now is that you permit us to vote upon this great question. Every rule of the Senate has been strictly followed. The requisite motion has been made, and under your construction it now requires a two-thirds vote to determine whether the Senate may in connection with the pending bill vote to purge the National Capital of one of the most infamous businesses that ever disgraced the world. What will your answer be?

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, when this question arose in the Senate I said that while I would vote to take up for consideration the report of the Committee on Rules, I would vote against the adoption of the report for reasons I would give later.

I am opposed to the adoption of the report of the committee because I think that paragraph 3 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate is a most excellent rule to conserve the proper consideration of bills of that nature pending in the Senate, its object, expressed in general terms, being to prevent the injection of foreign matter into the bill being considered.

If I had been a member of the committee, I would have felt compelled to vote against the temporary abrogation of the rule, because I think it very bad policy to suspend it in order to assist in the passage of any measure, however meritorious it might be considered by some or even by a majority of the Senate, because if done in one instance it could and should be done in others, while I think it should never be done in any case, but the rule be preserved inviolate for the general good of legislative procedure and of legislation itself, believing that all measures should be presented through the regular and proper methods of procedure and decided on their own merits.

For these reasons, and for these only, I shall vote against the adoption of the report; but my vote on this question is not necessarily an index to my vote on the amendment itself if the Senate adopts the report of the Committee on Rules.

#### PROHIBITION.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, since I have been a Member of this body I can not recall at this moment a measure which has been considered by it that I regard of as much moment to the American people as this. It involves the happiness and prosperity of the living and the well-being both of body and soul of posterity. It is a question of the highest privilege to humanity. As to the anxiety expressed by Senators on the question of suspending a rule or changing a rule—the importance of holding the rules inviolate, I confess that I am unable to understand and appreciate just what they mean, or to apprehend what harm is to grow out of this proposed suspension of the rule.

The rules of the Senate are the instruments of the Senate. It was never intended that the Senate should be the creature of, or subordinate to its rules. Whenever it becomes necessary in order to facilitate the business of Congress a mere rule should not stand in the way, if in the judgment of a majority of the body the thing under consideration should be done. I repeat, this rule worship is a form of fetishism that I can not



comprehend. Now, I would not approve or raise my voice in support of a measure that would take away from any American citizen a right vouchsafed to him or her by the Constitution.

I believe in liberty of action. I believe a man should be permitted to follow out, in the performance of the functions of citizenship and the private affairs of life, the processes of his own mind, and after he shall have reached a conclusion I believe it is his duty to express that conclusion, or if not, to live by it, at any rate. Nor would I permit one in the performance of his duty as a citizen to trench in any way upon the rights of somebody else.

There is nothing of that character in the proposition which the Senate is called upon this afternoon to consider. The question is whether or not the saloon is to be permitted in the District of Columbia, whether or not it is best for the people. It would not be out of place to consider also in this connection the effect of such an act in creating public sentiment throughout the Nation and the world.

Now, let us consider the observation and experiences of other nations as well as our own people with reference to this evil. The public mind is alert and the public conscience is aroused to the dangers to society involved in this damnable traffic. That it is an evil no well-ordered mind will deny. I read from an article in the *Technical World Magazine* for January, 1915. Senators, it is well worth your while to weigh the facts set out in this paper.

At a blow the autocrat of all the Russias, Czar Nicholas, has liberated 150,000,000 people. He has done for his people what the free-born American citizens have been unable to do for themselves. It is a new freedom that has come to Russia—a kind of freedom that the world has never before seen; the Czar's edict has liberated his subjects from the oppression of alcohol.

As by magic, drunkenness has vanished from the Empire and the \$1,000,000,000 annually spent for intoxicating drinks will be diverted to other purposes. It has been a comparatively easy thing for Russia to do this, because the manufacture of strong liquors is a Government monopoly. For many years our National Government has been assailed by the friends of prohibition for its attitude on the liquor question. They have, first of all, demanded that the Government cease levying revenue on intoxicating liquors; and, secondly, that the manufacture and sale of such liquors be stopped within the boundaries of the United States; but little progress seems to have been made in this direction.

If America becomes liquor-free in the next generation, as some industrial leaders predict, it will probably be because of the drastic action of our industries, which can not stand by and see large possible profits swallowed up by alcoholism.

Of course we all know that railroads have long maintained strict rules in regard to drinking among employees, but do we know that within the last few years practically every great industry in the country has established similar rules?

Drinking will now spell prompt dismissal for you if you are an employee of the Hershey Chocolate Co., International Harvester Co., Sherwin-Williams Co., Sheffield Car Works, United States Steel Corporation, Western Electric Co., Pullman Co., Edison Co., Western Union, Interborough Co., Standard Oil Co., or any one of a thousand other American firms of the first rank.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. forbid employees entering a saloon at any hour of the day within a mile of their plant in any direction.

Dalzell Bros. Co. declare that "as the State insurance rate is affected by the number of accidents, we are determined not to place ourselves liable to an increased rate," and they accordingly rule that promotions shall go to total abstainers only.

Thick and fast during the present year industries have been lining up in the efficiency campaign against the common enemy, "booze."

On March 27, 1914, a sweeping order was issued by the United States Steel Mills, covering the entire Mahoning Valley, to the effect that hereafter all promotions would be made only from the ranks of those who do not indulge in the use of intoxicating drinks.

Last spring a local-option election was held in the "dry town" of Three Rivers, Mich. The big industry of the town is the Sheffield Car Works. The management of these works issued a circular letter to the many thousand workmen advising them that if they signed wet petitions they would by that act be placing themselves in opposition to the interests of the company.

Yes, and only a few months ago the great steel works at Homestead, Pa., employing 12,000 men, decreed that not only would drinking be prohibited during working hours, but that even the slightest intemperance while off duty would be cause for immediate discharge.

Recently the Philadelphia Quartz Co. conducted a pledge campaign among its employees. The men were offered a 10 per cent increase if they would pledge themselves not to use liquor nor to frequent places where it was sold or used. Practically all of the men made the promise.

This magazine could be crammed to the covers with similar instances of the strong front industry has assumed against alcohol during the last two years.

The sentiment of the executives of industry is pretty well summed up in the pointed statement of Andrew Carnegie:

"There is no use wasting time on any young man who drinks liquor, no matter how exceptional his talents."

And note this: C. L. Close, manager of the famous Bureau of Safety of the United States Steel Corporation, a man who knows the social side of industry as few men do, declares his opinion that in 10 years, through the combined effort of American industries, the manufacture and sale of liquors will be at an end in the United States.

What does it all mean? Have our industrial leaders been caught up in the swirl of religious revival? Has a moral renaissance begun to climb up through the hearts of our captains of industry?

Not a bit of it! They are as disinterestedly interested in the almighty dollar as they ever were, but their eyes have been opened. They see dollars, thousands, millions of them, slipping away, and they are going to stop the leak or know the reason why.

And here is the leak—exposed unmistakably by the laboratory experiments of Dr. Emil Kraepelin, of the University of Munich.

With the ergograph, a little instrument for measuring the weight-lifting strength of workers, Dr. Kraepelin found that on days when the alcoholic equivalent of a good glass of Bordeaux was taken, the amount of work done by the subjects was decreased by from 7 to 9 per cent.

A number of accountants were given daily, in divided doses, the equivalent of three and a half cups of claret. After two weeks of this steady, moderate alcoholic allowance, their average ability to add one-figure columns had decreased 15.3 per cent.

Four typesetters, each drinking daily three-quarters of a tumbler of Greek wine (18 per cent alcohol), lost an average of 9.6 per cent in efficiency by the end of one week.

In coordination tests, where the subject was required to snap down a telegraphic switch at the unexpected flash of a light or sound of a gong, the rapidity of the coordinating responses was decreased by liquor from 6 to 8.3 per cent.

Tests by other scientists tell the same story.

Prof. Durig, an expert mountain climber, found that on days when he took two glasses of beer his instruments showed that he expended 15 per cent more energy than on the days when he did not drink, and that it took him 21.7 per cent longer to reach the top of a mountain.

In many industries employees do but a single small piece of work, repeating the same motions, using the same muscles, over and over all day long. Tests of Swedish marksmanship illustrated the effects of alcohol upon endurance in such repetition work. Upon the alcoholic days the soldiers averaged only 3 hits out of 30 shots, while on their abstinent days they averaged 23 to 26 hits out of 30. It is significant that they thought they were shooting better after they drank!

Lord Kitchener pleaded with the friends of the British recruits as they started for the front not to "treat" them to liquor. With the declaration of hostilities, Czar Nicholas issued his now famous ukase, which ended, once and for all, the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor by the Russian Government. Writes Prof. Thomas C. Hall, of the Union Theological Seminary, who was appointed Roosevelt professor at the University of Berlin for the year 1915-16: "With the first proclamation of war all drinking in the German Army was ordered stopped at once." Assuredly, the war lords have discovered that an efficient army is a sober one.

If an office worker takes only so much as one glass of beer daily, he decreases his efficiency 7 per cent, according to experiments of Bergman, Kraepelin, Mayer, and Klnz.

The drinking man can not stand heat or cold as well, remember as well, smell as well, see or hear as well as the nondrinking man. Such is the finding of experiments performed by Prof. Kraepelin, Prof. Frollich, Dr. Ridge, of England, and Prof. Vogt, of the University of Christiania.

So much for the verdict of the laboratory. Now, what has been the actual experience of industries? Have they noticed any practical, workaday difference in the efficiency of alcoholic and nonalcoholic workmen?

Here is one instance. The manager of a copper mine at Knockmahon, Germany, was convinced that his output would increase if his men quit drinking. He induced 1,000 of them to take the pledge. He was delighted to find, after two years, that their productive efficiency had increased nearly \$25,000 annually.

Coming nearer home: President Wilborn, of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., makes this striking statement in regard to the closing of saloons in the Colorado mining districts:

"With the advent of the Federal troops all saloons in the coal-mining districts were closed, and as a result the efficiency of the workmen has greatly improved, the average production of coal per man increasing about 10 per cent.

"The production at this company's mines in the southern district of Colorado for the first 18 days of April averaged 5.85 tons per day for each miner at work. That was before the Federal troops closed the saloons. For the first 18 days of June, with all saloons closed, each man produced 6.52 tons, which meant an average increase in wages of more than 11 per cent per man.

"This has confirmed the view long held by us, that if saloons and drinking could be eliminated from the coal districts not only the miners but the companies would be greatly benefited.

"What I have said applies specifically to the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., but I think in a general way it is true of the coal-mining industry in the State."

Spilled work is no small part of the loss which drink lays upon industry. A workman in one of the Coatesville steel mills declares that when the saloons were open it was not unusual for 20 to 40 tons of steel to be spoiled in the rolling following pay days. Thus the earnings of every tonnage man in the mill were reduced because of the half-drunken condition of some of the men. "But, with the closing of the saloons," he adds, "that's all history now."

There is evidence that a shorter working day, permitting workers to stop before the physical limit of fatigue has been reached, results in a falling off of the desire to indulge in intoxicants.

Boyd Fisher, vice president of a club of Detroit executives, says:

"A good many Detroit employers are wise enough to see that in a large number of cases excessive drinking is a direct result of too long hours at monotonous work. Wherever they have shortened the working hours they have minimized drinking and secured a compensating increase in output."

The Burroughs Adding Machine Co. is a case in point. This firm shortened the working day from nine and one-half hours to eight hours. A noticeable decrease in drinking followed, and a slight increase in the output per man.

A thorn in the side of industry has been the proverbially meager output of Monday. Industrialists are now discovering that if there is no drinking on Saturday and Sunday there is no falling off of output on Monday.

"Blue Monday in the industries of Kokomo is a thing of the past," says J. E. Frederick, of the Kokomo Steel & Iron Co. Kokomo, Ind., is a city without saloons. "On Monday our factories are able to secure the same output as on any other day of the week. This was not the case when saloons were running."

"Monday has stepped up with the other days of the week," say a manufacturer in Buckhannon, W. Va.

"Manufacturers have no off days now in Kansas," says the Thomas Page Milling Co., of North Topeka. "The men are just as fresh at the beginning of the week as at the close."

So it goes. From 50 different angles industry is to-day looking critically and cynically at the results of alcohol.

Do you wonder, then, that most of the money for the campaign which made West Virginia dry was contributed by labor-employing industries in the State? West Virginia abounds in coal, lumber, oil, and



gas industries. These were, almost to a unit, active workers for State-wide prohibition.

Judge J. C. McWhorter, who had charge of the campaign, says: "While I was helping to raise funds for our constitutional prohibition campaign a brewer from another State who had no liquor business in West Virginia, but who had thousands of dollars invested in certain other industries in the State, sent me his check for \$250 to help make West Virginia dry, because he knew what liquor was doing to his men and his business."

What the industries within the Nation have learned the Nation itself is learning. Abstinence is becoming the enforced rule of national engineering projects. The way Col. Gorgas obtained increased efficiency by reducing alcoholism among his canal builders is interesting in this connection.

He writes, in a paper published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, June 13:

"On the Isthmus we had our laboring force located on the line of the canal, about 50 miles in extent. In this distance we had about 20 towns. At first we allowed as many liquor establishments as chose to pay the high license—\$1,200 per year. As time went on we gradually abolished saloons in town after town until last year liquor selling was finally abolished in all the zone."

"The two Panama towns of Colon and Panama, at the northern and southern ends of the canal, are not under the jurisdiction of the commission so far as regards liquor selling. There is no restriction on an employee going to these towns and getting liquor when he wishes and bringing it into the zone to his own home. The only prohibition is that it must not be sold in the zone; but to get liquor he has to make a longer or shorter railroad trip and go to considerable effort. Our experience has shown that there are a considerable number of men who do not care enough for liquor to make the effort, and therefore do without."

"The efficiency of our working force has increased so much that generally the men in charge of the laborers in the different districts have asked to have their districts included within the prohibition area."

Another big national business, known as the American Navy, has also learned the alcoholism-efficiency lesson. On July 1, 1914, the order went into effect prohibiting the introduction of intoxicating beverages into the ships of the Navy, the naval stations, and all points under the jurisdiction of the Navy.

It is not commonly known that one of the chief considerations which startled Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels into this action was the fact, revealed by the medical inspector of the United States Navy, that there were nearly ten times as many admissions to the hospital among the British sailors as among the German sailors. If alcohol was sending so many men to the hospital, it was undoubtedly rendering inefficient a still larger number of men who did not get as far as the hospital. Alcohol, in the name of efficiency, was banned.

Four years ago, long before this action was considered, Germany's far-seeing Kaiser, in a great speech to his naval cadets, urged them to form total-abstinence societies as the British had done.

"Naval service demands a height of effort which it is hardly possible to surpass," said the Kaiser. "It is necessary that you be able to endure continued heavy strain without exhaustion, in order to be fresh for emergencies."

"In the next great war nerve power will decide the victory. Victory will lie with the nation that uses the smallest amount of alcohol."

The verdicts of the laboratory, of industry, and of the Nation against alcohol are the same. Because it is a breeder of inefficiency, it must go. And in America, at least, the prospect is that it will be driven out by hard-hearted, firm-fisted industry. The great god industry cares not a rap for the moral or social phases of the drink question, although the big men who are his directing forces may be industrially greatly concerned. Alcohol might trample on the garments of morality and social relations until doomsday and it would not worry industry as such; but when alcohol begins to tease and harass the great god's pet mascot—efficiency—that is quite another matter. Drastic measures must be taken.

Already the American Foundrymen's Association has appointed a well-financed committee to campaign in every State for legislation to push back the saloon from the doorways of industrial plants. That will not satisfy industry. At the end of five years, probably, every great business will have united its forces against alcohol; and who knows but that at the end of 10 years the prediction of C. L. Close will have been realized and industry will have banished the manufacture and sale of liquor from the United States?

Apparently it does not matter very much whether we want this to happen or not. If industry wants it, it will come to pass. The best thing we can do is to hope that, when that added six billion saved by efficiency is divided, we may come in for a share.

Who will undertake to answer the eloquent arguments which the facts that I have just read present in behalf of prohibition? Who is bold and brazen enough to appear as apologist for the liquor traffic? Who will have the effrontery to stand up in the light of eternal truth and in defiance of the moral sentiment of the world defend this infinite iniquity? If the great captains of industry have discovered that even the moderate use of intoxicating liquors is so harmful, so hurtful to the brain and the body of the individual, by what process of reasoning can the officers of the Government and representatives of the people—the lawmaking body of this Republic—justify the continuance of the traffic in this deadly drug? Will Democratic Senators be justified in voting to perpetuate the traffic in order that it might win votes for the Democratic Party? Has the Democratic Party fallen so low or gotten in such desperate straits that it must depend upon the influence of the saloon to keep it in power? God of nations, save us from the humiliation of such a thought. Mr. President, no political party depending upon that influence for supremacy can be of service to the Nation very long.

The stream can not rise above its source. If the source be impure, that same impurity will characterize the entire course of the stream. I love the Democratic Party, its history, and traditions. I believe the underlying principles upon which it

rests are indispensable to the fulfillment of the purposes of the founders of this Government and the permanency of our institutions; but rather than have the Democratic Party depend upon the influence of the saloon for victory I would prefer to see it pass to honorable and harmless oblivion.

But some gentlemen have announced the strange doctrine that the Government is under a moral obligation not to prohibit traffic in intoxicating liquors because it would affect vested pecuniary interests. The brewers, the distillers, and the wine makers, they maintain, have enormous sums of money invested, for which they have a right to demand of the Government protection. That is an old argument. That is the doctrine of Cain—a doctrine so conclusively and completely condemned by the lessons taught by the Nazarene—in such shameful violation of the spirit of the Golden Rule, that it has no place in the economy of this Republic.

To the malign influence of such a theory are traceable the overthrow of republics, the dissolution of empires, and the absolute obliteration of civilizations. Mr. President, the love of money is the root of all evil, and it is a root which grows deep and permeates the soil of human nature. It has been the case in all the ages of the world, however, and among all the peoples of the earth. Some few men of the present are great enough to resist its sordid and debauching influences, but there are very few. Too often the dollar is the standard of excellency and the accumulation of money the measure of success. Conditions at the beginning of the twentieth century—the hopes and aspirations of men—are to a certain extent the same that they were in other days and among other peoples at some period in their history.

Human nature does not change. It is the same to-day that it was when the peripatetic philosopher taught his hungry-eared pupils beneath the classic shades of ancient Greece. It is the same to-day that it was when Confucius startled a world with his benign philosophy. It has not changed a particle since the Pharaohs ruled in Egypt. The only difference is environment and opportunity. Scan carefully the pages of the histories of ancient Greece and Rome and you will find a prototype or precedent for almost any and every thing that appears in our modern civilization.

At this moment there comes to me in all of its vividness the picture painted by Oliver Goldsmith:

But, scarce observed, the knowing and the bold  
Fall in the general massacre of gold;  
Wide-wasting pest; that rages unconfined;  
And crowds with crimes the records of mankind;  
For gold his sword the hireling ruffian draws,  
For gold the hireling judge distorts the laws;  
Wealth heaped on wealth nor truth nor safety buys,  
The dangers gather as the treasures rise.

Gold has become the god and commerce the religion, I am sorry to say, with a large class of the people of this Republic. I have often thought of the effect of accumulated wealth upon the characters and natures of men, and I have also observed its effect upon the earth in which the gold is found. Some years ago I visited the rich gold fields of Cripple Creek, Colo., and after ascending the rugged, barren, rocky mountains and going down into the dark, rock-ribbed pit, where men suffer and sacrifice, toil, and die in search of the precious metal, I thought of the effect of hoarded gold upon the human soul. There was not a beautiful flower to be seen in all the landscape, no waving grass, no luxuriant vegetation, no umbrageous trees that spread their giant arms and afford the weary traveler the refreshing shade, no soft and gentle zephyrs to cool the fevered cheek of the wayfarer or waft the perfume of the rose which delight the heart of man. There was nothing but rocks—barren, cold, conscienceless rocks. Down into the dark recess, in the cruel grasp of this granite, the precious metal lay. It requires the most desperate work and painful search to find it, and when it is found the use of dynamite and other powerful explosives is employed to release it from the relentless, avaricious grasp of the gray flint. And after it is gotten out it must be ground, burned, and melted before it is fit for the use of man. And so is its influence upon him who gives his life for its accumulation. Years of toil, sacrifice, and self-abnegation are devoted to its acquisition, and when acquired in great quantities it usually leaves the heart barren of the fragrance of love, the aroma of friendship, and devoid altogether of the true spirit of altruism. There are no cooling shades of charity in the garden of the heart—there is none of the fragrance of affection where the weak and helpless may go for succor and rest. Cold, conscienceless, selfish, stingy, bereft of all the nobler virtues which glorify the life of one "who loves his fellow man," a heart as hard as the rock in which the gold is found and as remorseless as the granite which grasps it with the grip of death away down in the bowels of the earth.



Mr. President, the end of all government should be the benefit of humanity—for the uplift of mankind, and every law which is devoid of that spirit and purpose is a reproach to the men who breathe into it the breath of life. The saloon is indefensible. It is a social cancer, an economic blight. Somebody has truthfully and forcefully said of the saloon bar. It is—

A bar to heaven, a door to hell—  
Whoever named it named it well!  
A bar to manliness and wealth,  
A door to want and broken health.  
A bar to honor, pride, and fame,  
A door to sin and grief and shame;  
A bar to hope, a bar to prayer,  
A door to darkness and despair.  
A bar to honored, useful life,  
A door to brawling, senseless strife;  
A bar to all that's true and brave,  
A door to every drunkard's grave.  
A bar to joy that home imparts,  
A door to tears and aching hearts;  
A bar to heaven, a door to hell—  
Whoever named it, named it well!

Mr. President, if I were called upon at this moment to name the one thing that has wrought the most harm in the world, blighted more lives, frustrated more ambitions, caused more scalding tears to fall from the eyes of woman than all the other agencies of evil combined, I should say the intemperate use of intoxicating liquors. Whisky taken immoderately is hurtful physically, financially, mentally, and morally. As an evil it is without a mitigating incident. It is the one deadly drug in which the jewels of the heart's best love are dissolved and poured into the mouths of men to madden the brain and destroy the soul.

I have observed its ravages. I have seen the destruction of character; I have seen the happy home, musical with the laughter of children, warm with the atmosphere of love and contentment, changed to a place of sorrow and shame. I once had a young friend who was almost as great a genius as Byron or Prentiss. I knew him in the morning of life; the pulses of youthful spring bounded in his veins; hope sprang eternal in his breast. Life to him was a glorious prospect. He lived in a world of promise. At an unguarded moment he entered the saloon, drawn there by the siren song of temptation. The first drop of the seductive drug that passed his lips fired the latent appetite, which probably was the uncoveted legacy from indiscreet ancestors. He went back again, and again, and again until the love for the accursed stuff had become a gnawing disease against which his imperious will was absolutely helpless. I saw the sparkle in his youthful, manly, intellectual eye turned to the stupid, leaden gaze of the inebriate. I saw the sun of hope and happiness go behind the cloud of dissipation and death ere it reached the meridian; and I said the cause that wrought this man's downfall society ought to remove. Anything that encourages excessive drinking and leads to this unhappy end is an enemy to society and ought to be exterminated. I maintain that the most valuable thing beneath the stars is a human being, and I know that the highest end of government is the development and improvement of man. If the man be improved the government will share of his improvement and the moral sentiment will write the laws of the land.

I have heard a thousand arguments in favor of closing the saloons, but I have never heard a decent suggestion in favor of keeping them open. The influence of the saloon is pernicious in politics. The soul-quenched, brain-soaked, body-distorted habits of these dens of iniquity, with eyes like frost-bitten plums and noses like frozen tomatoes, with the story of a life of crime and dissipation written in those mysterious hieroglyphics upon their besotted faces—these men are easy victims of the ward rounder and political bribe giver. They hold the love of drink and lawless power above the interests of their country. Oh, it is hurtful to the church; it destroys the happy home; it fills the jails with criminals, the asylums with lunatics, and the world with idiots and paupers. Verily it is a Circean vortex, from whose voluptuous whirl come human swine to scatter seeds of sin and death, from which shall surely spring the tares of biting sorrow.

Mr. President, a glorious opportunity is presented to the Senate and House of Representatives to drive this evil from the Capital City of the Nation, to make it a city set upon a hill, the cynosure of all eyes that look for righteousness in government—a glorious example for the emulation of the municipalities of this Republic. Washington should be the model city government of America; its parks and statuary should be so splendid in all their arrangements as to meet the approval of the most esthetic taste; its streets and architecture should conform to the most substantial and enduring type; its laws should be justice applied in its purest and best form. In a word, Mr. President, it should be a city in all of its appointments which

would body forth the highest thought and best purposes in government. The opportunity is at hand for this Congress to achieve this great work—to honor itself—and after it shall be done let us not forget that we shall have rendered a service to humanity, which, after all, is the most acceptable service to God.

I agree with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] that it is only a question of a short time when this Republic shall be rid of this greatest of social evils. You may defeat this resolution to-day; you may defeat this measure next year; but just as surely as right shall triumph over wrong, when the good judgment and patriotic sentiment of the American people shall be crystallized into law there will be no saloons in the District of Columbia. It takes time to work out all great reforms. Error intrenched always fights stubbornly against the onward march of truth. Indeed—

The paths of truth in every age have led men to  
Gethsemane—to mocking and a cross  
Its sacred light hath rent the veil behind  
Which error long has been concealed; and though  
The priests of wrong have raged and sought to blind  
With thongs the souls of men, right on the tides  
Of truth have swept; nor mobs, nor hate, nor yet  
The Cross can stay the morning of its triumph.

Mr. President, I shall count myself fortunate, though in the minority, to have taken a humble part in this great effort to serve humanity, for I realize that the real greatness of the Republic does not consist—

In hewn stone nor in well-fashioned beams,  
Not in the noblest of the builder's dreams,  
But in courageous men of purpose great—  
There is the fortress, there is the living state.

The consuming desire of my soul is that I may be able to do something to buttress the "fortress" and strengthen the "living state." I shall be satisfied if, when the last settlement comes, that my name may be recorded among those who "loved and served their fellow man."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think my friend from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] was rather unfortunate when he quoted Chauncey Depew. I think he said that Mr. Depew had stated that the prominent men with whom he had associated for the past 50 years in legislative halls had filled drunkards' graves, or words to that effect.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not all of them.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, how many of them?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Only those he had met in the legislature at that time.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, well, then, it was the legislature, and that is not on my side of the House. I will say that that was an extravagant statement, which I do not believe can be borne out by the facts. I have met very many in the halls of legislation on both sides of the political question, none of whom were given to the use of alcohol; and I have, as God is my judge, yet to know one of them who when he died filled a drunkard's grave.

The Senator quoted something from Lincoln, and doubtless his quotation was correct as to what Lincoln may have said on the question of the unbridled use of liquor; but there was another thing the Senator might have quoted which Lincoln said. During the civil strife, when the cry was "On to Richmond," Lincoln was being beset on all sides with the suggestion, "Change this general and supplant him with another." Finally one humanitarian came to him and said, "Mr. Lincoln, you will never succeed until you change Grant. You must change Grant." "Why?" asked Lincoln. "Why, Grant drinks." What was Lincoln's response? The Senator did not quote that. Lincoln said, "Tell me the brand of liquor Grant uses, as I want to send it to some of the other generals who are in our Army." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what Senators have said is all very well and all very nice, but you from Texas and you from Mississippi do not love humanity with a deeper love than do I. It is all very well to ring the changes on the particular species of fanaticism that has obsessed your lives.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, well, wait until I get through. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey declines to yield at this time.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, notwithstanding all that has been said to us here to-day, this is a pretty good world, if we know how to take it. That is your trouble. It has wagged along for several thousand years blessing most of us far beyond our deserts. [Laughter.] Conditions here



suit me pretty well as they are at present. This is a beautiful world, and this is a beautiful and well-governed city, as I see it. The people who make up this city are to me of a most pleasing and intellectual character, and I do not think it is well at this time to try to make this world or this city over.

Mr. President, it is a remarkable fact that all the grains and all the fruits given by the great God of creation to His creatures that are most nutritious and desirable are richest in alcohol. I need only cite wheat, rye, corn, oats, rice, and, in the realm of fruits, the grape, the peach, and the apple. This was not an accident, but with a purpose deeper than our finite minds can fathom or discover.

Under present conditions this city has advanced in every way—in beauty, in morals, in education, and in charity—until it is even held up to the world as a model city.

Mr. President, primarily I oppose prohibition because it is un-American and undemocratic, and has for its purpose the interference with the rights of the citizen and the destruction of private property without thought of recompense. I am opposed to prohibition because wherever it has been tried it has proved a failure. I say in the State of South Carolina it is an absolute failure; I say in Georgia it is a failure; I say in cities innumerable it is a failure.

In this connection I might cite my own city. Years ago, when an effort to secure prohibition was made there, and no licenses were granted, the result was, as the police records will show, that there were more arrests for drunkenness during the year of the so-called prohibition reign than in any other year. Literally, uncanny holes and lockers were established in various parts of the town, to the general detriment of the community.

The advocates of these measures are going to reform the world by suffrage and prohibition. I have here a little clipping from the New York Tribune, headed "Suffrage and Prohibition," signed by a woman whose name is Elizabeth T. Holmes, who asserts that suffrage will not correct the drink habit nor will prohibition correct it, but insists that women attend to their own matters, to their own homes and households, and that by so doing they will do more to advance the well-being of their sex and of the human race than in any other way. I ask to insert at this point the clipping to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The clipping referred to is as follows:

SUFFRAGE AND PROHIBITION—A NEW JERSEY WOMAN CONTENT TO DO WITHOUT EITHER.

UNION HILL, N. J., July 18, 1914.

To the Editor of the Tribune.

SIR: The sentiments expressed by Mary E. Cobb in her letter are just such as one might expect from a narrow-minded woman who thinks that the best and only way to get real temperance is by voting prohibition.

Indeed, most of the women who are shouting for the ballot actually imagine that their vote will in some unexplained way bring about wonderful and even miraculous reforms and improvements in society, in politics, and in business—perhaps.

What woman's suffrage would bring about would be 57 different kinds of fake or sham reforms, including the farce of prohibition, which is the greatest of all.

As a resident for many years in New Jersey, the State which Mary E. Cobb compares unfavorably with Maine, I do not want the ballot, nor do I want the brand or kind of prohibition I have seen in Maine and elsewhere.

ELIZABETH T. HOLMES.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. "Break up the saloon," is the cry. Well, Mr. President, if there was not a demand for the saloon it would not exist for a single day. Lack of bread and butter, an empty stomach, a harassed mind, 10 hours of toil in a noisome atmosphere in shop and mill, sewer or ditch, are the feeders of your saloon.

Mr. President, I was called on the telephone at my home last night at 10 o'clock, the party at the other end of the wire telling me that we must abolish the saloon. He said the city was aflame with the sentiment for the abolition of the saloon, and requested me to meet him at the Metropolitan Club, where we might talk about it over a glass. [Laughter.] Innocently I asked him where the Metropolitan Club was; and I asked him, too, if it was a perfectly proper place for an old gentleman to go. [Laughter.] He answered me, "Oh, yes; very quiet and highly respectable," with a peculiar emphasis on the words "highly respectable." Think of it, Mr. President! Here was a man wanting to rid the community of the saloon, but inviting and enticing an old man to a highly respectable resort called a club, with a gilded bar. God save me from such hypocrisy.

I cite again, as I have before, the words of that sweet angel of temperance who has gone to her reward, Frances E. Willard, whose sweet and sympathetic voice pleaded that we first make it easier for mankind to get bread and butter, and then, mayhap, our teachings might fall in more fertile soil. To my

mind this is the solution of the whole question: Give mankind happy homes, let them be well clad, well sheltered, and well fed, and the problem of the drink question will disappear as dew before the rising sun.

Mr. President, I feel that conditions throughout our country prove something. Let me take two States, one "wet" and the other "dry"—one the State of Kansas, a prohibition State, and the other Nebraska, two States which are very much alike in conditions and in population. As to the conditions in those two States I quote the following from the New York Sun:

"DRY" AND "WET"—SOME FIGURES OF PAUPERISM AND INSANITY IN TWO STATES.

To the Editor of the Sun.

SIR: Mr. William H. Anderson in his letter to the Sun, published July 20, says:

"The Federal census report shows that the prohibition States over the country not only have less pauperism and less insanity but less crime on the average, in proportion to population, than the 'wet' States."

Kansas is the model "dry" State, and Nebraska, her nearest neighbor, with like natural conditions, is "wet."

The Federal census report on insane and feeble-minded in institutions, 1910 (Bulletin 119), gives these figures for Kansas and Nebraska: Insane in hospitals January 1, 1910: Kansas, 2,912; Nebraska, 1,990; admitted in 1910, Kansas, 905; Nebraska, 411; insane with alcoholic psychosis, admitted in 1910, Kansas, 70; Nebraska, 20; feeble-minded in institutions January 1, 1910, Kansas, 420; Nebraska, 446; admitted in 1910, Kansas, 86; Nebraska, 23.

Bulletin 121 of the Bureau of Census, Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents, 1910, gives these figures as enumerated January 1, 1910: Kansas, 1,971; Nebraska, 789; prisoners, Kansas, 1,537; Nebraska, 656; juvenile delinquents, Kansas, 434; Nebraska, 133; prisoners committed for grave homicide, Kansas, 100; Nebraska, 44; for major assault, Kansas, 77; Nebraska, 40; for minor assault, Kansas, 28; Nebraska, 4; for robbery, Kansas, 89; Nebraska, 29; for burglary, Kansas, 275; Nebraska, 130; for larceny, Kansas, 619; Nebraska, 163; for fraud, Kansas, 22; Nebraska, 10; for forgery, Kansas, 93; Nebraska, 41; for rape, Kansas, 86; Nebraska, 37; for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, Kansas, 29; Nebraska, 52; for violating liquor law, Kansas, 72; Nebraska, 2. Bulletin No. 120, Paupers in Almshouses, 1910, gives these figures: Paupers enumerated in almshouses on January 1, 1910: Kansas, 735; Nebraska, 551.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 23.

Mr. President, I regret sincerely to find myself arrayed against the Senators who are supporting this measure. They are my friends, and I have the greatest regard and respect for the motives and the high ideals they proclaim; but, Mr. President, while feeling thus, I ask from them and from my countrymen the same generous and charitable consideration. I yield to none in my desire for temperance and sobriety; I will not knowingly support a measure that I feel will bring degradation to a single mortal; I yield to none in my love for my fellows; and I only ask that when the great God may carry me hence it may be said of me, "He loved his fellow man." But, Senators, your path is a mistaken one; your guideposts point you the wrong way. Circumstances alone make drunkards.

There are two elements that press upon me on this question and urge upon me their respective views. One claims that the distillers and the whisky dealers have no rights which Congress is bound to respect; the other says that they produce over a third of the internal revenue, and hence we must not touch their business. Neither of these arguments has any weight whatever with me. I shall vote upon grounds of right and justice and for that which I believe will advance the general well-being and prosperity of my country. I can not agree with the narrow thoughts which have been advanced by the other side.

We have, Mr. President, in the United States about 3,000,000 people who class themselves as Christian Scientists. They practice and preach that the use of drugs is not necessary to cure human ills; that drugs are a curse. Let these people—and I say this with all respect to this great element of our society—be able to gather votes enough and they would endeavor to prevent by legislation the use of drugs in this country. Then, too, comes the vegetarian, declaring that the use of meat is unclean and generally deleterious to health and that mankind should live upon vegetables. With votes enough this school might ask, with as much reason, that this body legislate against the use and transportation of meat throughout the country.

Senators, I appeal to you not to be carried away by this sectional clamor and narrow view. This great Government was not established on one idea, nor can it be maintained on a one-idea policy. A widely different policy has extended our territorial possessions until we reach from sea to sea and from the Gulf to Niagara's mighty cataract, that is sending up ceaseless anthems to the Most High over a happy and prosperous people. Through a broader and more liberal policy America has written on the pages of history a story at which the world marvels. Mr. President, with this unparalleled story before us of our



glorious and magnificent progress I ask why should we enter at this time this devious, dubious, and dangerous path?

On God Almighty's footstool there is no more intelligent or God-fearing people than those who make up the population of this favored land and of this splendid city. This great result has come about without the enactment of this or of other similar drastic laws. I urge you, my friends, in the interest and well-being of humanity, in the interest and well-being of the progress of our land, and to advance the glories of this city, the Capital of the Nation, that these narrow thoughts be brushed aside and find no place in the future.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] has taken the occasion of this debate to undertake to make comparisons between the State which I in part represent and a neighboring State, very much to the detriment, in his opinion, of the character and intelligence of the people of Kansas. I do not in any way reflect upon the people of Nebraska. They are a good people, and their State is a great State and worthy of the high position it holds in the Federal Union. It is not stated, however, in the clipping from which the Senator from New Jersey has quoted that Kansas has a population something like half a million more than Nebraska; and the data which is submitted indicates, if it indicates anything, that the people of Kansas have made ample provision to care in every way for the unfortunates who may need their care.

So far as prohibition is concerned, Kansas has tested its merits, and you can not find within the boundaries of a limited area on the face of God's globe a better people, a people more intelligent, people who practice morality to a greater degree, a people of more energy, or a people amongst whom there is so little crime. You may travel through that State from one end to the other, and you will find county after county with not a single person in the county jail or living on the county poor farm. Nothing has contributed to her prosperity and to her moral and material welfare so much as her prohibitory law. She stands to-day a model Commonwealth for mankind to pattern after. If the State of New Jersey would pattern after her and suppress vice and crime and its causes, the State of New Jersey would improve her social condition.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to say right there that the Senator should realize, first, one fact. Geographically New Jersey is situated between the great Empire State of New York, with a great port open to the world, on one side, and the State of Pennsylvania on the other. We have New York City and we have Philadelphia, both great ports, great cities, whose population runs into the millions, so that naturally we might reap some of the evils that come from great cities. [Laughter.] But I say that, in proportion to her population, there is no Commonwealth in this land that can show a better result or a better file of statistics than the humble little Commonwealth of New Jersey.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind Senators that it is against the rules of the Senate to refer offensively to any State in the Union.

Mr. GALLINGER. And, Mr. President, I will call the attention of the Chair to the fact that three different times on yesterday the Presiding Officer notified the galleries that they were violating the rules because they smiled at some observations here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will please preserve order.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I desire to express my surprise that the Senator from New Jersey, in the situation provoked by the Senator from Kansas, should find it necessary to resort to the plea of confession and avoidance.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, the Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I know that the Senator from New Jersey had no intention of transferring to the city of New York or the city of Philadelphia the responsibility for any possible abuses that may exist in the State of New Jersey. Living as close to it as I do, I should be prepared to say that there was absolutely no foundation for the criticism of my friend from Kansas regarding the great Commonwealth of New Jersey, and it would have afforded me much pleasure if the distinguished Senator

from New Jersey had placed his answer upon the same ground. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I only desire to say that God knows, Mr. President, that I have no desire or thought of bringing disrepute upon the State of New York. I first drank from my mother's bosom the milk of justice and liberty in the city of New York. It is my birthplace, and I think a good deal of it. I did not say just what the evils were. It may have been the preponderance of genius from New York that sometimes overlaps and comes over there and makes a good many laws about which there is some criticism.

As to Pennsylvania—I see there is one Senator from Pennsylvania here—I was about to say that in the absence of the Senators from that State I hesitate to make criticisms. Nothing but the little, narrow Delaware River divides us, and we sniff their breezes, get some of the benefits of their intellect, and reap much of the benefit of their culture, both in liquid and in solid form, so I have understood.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that I did not intend to cast any reflections upon the State of New Jersey. I think it is unfortunate that the genial and distinguished Senator, who is one of her representatives on this floor, should feel it his duty to rise and defend the brothels and the saloons in the District of Columbia.

If there is anything on the face of God's earth that ought to be banished from civilized society, it is the drinking saloon. It is an evil influence in every community where it lurks. It debases the morals, it deadens the intellect, it poisons the very character of society. It is to be regretted that any State should have a Senator who would stand upon the floor of the United States Senate and defend such a hideous institution as the open saloon, with its offensive signs, which every citizen who visits the National Capital sees plastered upon the windows of the buildings as he passes.

I am glad to say that I live in a State where men and women have been born and have grown to manhood and womanhood and have never seen a saloon. It is a disgrace to the Nation that when they come to visit its Capital these sources of moral pestilence to society should be open, and thereby invite them to enter and corrupt their morals and debase their natures.

I hope to see the time when the saloon will be abolished, not only from the National Capital, but from the earth. Not a single Senator can stand on this floor and mention one good thing, one influence that is elevating or beneficial to mankind, that comes from the open saloon—not one.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Why emphasize the word "open"? Why does the Senator say "the open saloon"?

Mr. BRISTOW. I will say any kind of a saloon, or indulgence in intoxicating liquor in any form. I do not care whether it comes from a saloon or from some hidden source. Yet on this floor, where no Senator will stand and state a single good thing that can come from the saloon, we probably will have at least a third of this body who will vote to perpetuate saloons in the National Capital.

I regret that this resolution comes before the Senate as it does, requiring a two-thirds vote to put legislation of this character upon an appropriation bill, when I have sat here for almost six years and have seen legislation ingrafted on every appropriation bill that has ever passed this body. There is not a Senator in the Chamber this afternoon but who knows that legislation is ingrafted on every appropriation bill, and this bill is full of it; but when it comes to striking at the greatest evil in civilized society, then it is barred from being placed in the bill by a majority vote, as other legislation, and a two-thirds vote is required.

It was not my purpose to indulge in this debate, because I felt that, at least for the present, the proposition offered by the Senator from Texas, which is noble in its character and an honor to him, was beaten day before yesterday, and that, so far as this immediate motion was concerned, the fight was lost; but when the State which I in part have represented in this body for almost six years was brought into this debate in disparagement because she has driven the saloon from her borders, and driven it effectually and permanently, I could not sit silent.

Kansas is the enemy of the saloon. Why, the people of that State would no more harbor saloons in their midst again than they would take to their breasts vipers and rattlesnakes. The sentiment, after years of enforcement of our prohibitory law, is so overwhelmingly in its favor that no man representing any political organization of any consequence would dare to advocate its return. Kansas stands to-day in the high moral character of its people, in the conservative, intelligent, progressive character of its legislation, in the honesty of its administration



of public affairs, without a superior among the organized governments of mankind.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kansas have involved the reputation of the State of Nebraska in this debate, I desire to state exactly what the statistical abstract of the Government of the United States shows in several important particulars.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that I never in any way reflected in the slightest degree upon his State in the remarks I made. I spoke in high praise of its character and its citizenship.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did not intend to imply that anything said by the Senator from Kansas reflected upon my State; but I desire to show that the statement made by the Senator from New Jersey is in a large measure justified by the statistical reports of the United States.

The Senator from Kansas, in reply to the Senator from New Jersey, stated that the difference in the figures quoted by the Senator from New Jersey favorable to Nebraska was due to the fact that Kansas was a larger State and had 500,000 more population than the State of Nebraska. He was accurate as to the fact that Kansas has more population than the State of Nebraska, but he is obviously greatly in error when he questions the correctness of the figures favorable to Nebraska. Let us take the percentage applying to each State; and I can demonstrate that fact to him in a few moments by a number of figures.

Take the matter of paupers enumerated in almshouses in Nebraska and compare it with Kansas. There were in the State of Kansas in 1890 41.6 paupers for every 100,000 of population. In Nebraska there were 27.5 paupers for every 100,000 of population.

Take the matter of persons confined in penal institutions. The total number in Kansas is 1,746; in Nebraska, 519.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I ask the Senator what year he is quoting from?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That last was for the year 1904. I will also give the later years.

I will repeat. In 1904 there were in the State of Kansas 117 persons confined in penal institutions for every 100,000 of population, but in the State of Nebraska in that same year there were only 48 persons and a fraction per 100,000 of population confined in penal institutions.

In the year 1910 the number of persons confined in penal institutions in Nebraska was 55 for each 100,000 of population, but in Kansas it was 91.

Take the matter of insane persons, referred to by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Before the Senator leaves that matter, I should like to ask him whether the number of criminals does not depend a great deal upon other matters? If a census were taken to-day, South Carolina would not have a single inmate of the penitentiary. [Laughter.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that there is only one Bleese, as has been stated, and his jurisdiction extends neither to the State of Kansas nor to the State of Nebraska.

Take the matter of insane persons, referred to by the Senator from New Jersey. In 1910 there were 172 persons for every 100,000 population in Kansas in insane asylums. In Nebraska there were only 166. I leave off the fractions.

In the matter of illiterates, the illiterates of voting age in Kansas in the year 1910 numbered 14,716; in Nebraska only 8,545. The percentage in Kansas was 2.9 per cent; in Nebraska it was only 2.4 per cent.

I have quoted these statistics, which I have gathered hastily while the Senator from Kansas was on his feet, for the purpose of indicating that the Senator from New Jersey was correct when he stated that the high-license, strict-regulation State of Nebraska stands above the prohibition State of Kansas in net results. I am not reflecting upon the State of Kansas, and I doubt whether the Senator from New Jersey reflected upon the State of Kansas, because Kansas stands preeminent among prohibition States as being the State in which the best results have been attained among all prohibitory efforts; but I reaffirm that the Senator from New Jersey was right and was warranted when he referred to statistics as evidence that high license and regulation, as proven by the statistics of the United

States, produce the best net results in the matter of illiteracy, insanity, and inmates of penal institutions.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, so far as the Senator's statistics are concerned in regard to the inmates of penal institutions, they simply demonstrate that in Kansas we send our criminals to jail, while in Nebraska they do not. [Laughter.] So far as the insane are concerned, they demonstrate that we take care of our insane people, by providing places to care for them properly, much better in Kansas than they do in Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hardly think the Senator from Kansas intends to reflect upon the State of Nebraska. I have certainly paid the highest encomium I could to Kansas as a State where prohibition has attained the highest degree of efficiency among prohibition experiments. But even taking that highest degree of efficiency, and comparing it with the highest and best results under regulation, I think I am justified in quoting the statistics of the United States to show that Nebraska shows the best results; and even if the Senator's theory is correct about the penal institutions and the insane institutions of Kansas, he could not possibly answer the matter of illiteracy.

Mr. BRISTOW. So far as illiteracy is concerned, there is little difference; and what there is is due to some conditions relating to foreign immigration into the mining regions of our State, which has made illiteracy there somewhat higher than in Nebraska.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the Senator from Kansas if it is not a fact that more than half of Nebraska is dry, that more than half of it is under prohibitory law?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; a very large part of Nebraska is dry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. More than half of Nebraska is dry. What the Senator from Nebraska has read is a great tribute to prohibition in Nebraska.

Mr. BRISTOW. A great part of Nebraska is dry, and it would be a better thing for the State if it were all dry—very much better, indeed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not like to have any statements made about the State of Nebraska that are not correct. I think it is entirely inaccurate to say that Nebraska voted upon prohibition, and beat it overwhelmingly, just as the State of Texas voted upon prohibition and beat it recently. In Nebraska each community settles for itself what it wants. Each community, when it elects its local officers, decides whether it wants to permit the use of liquor or does not. We have self-rule and home government in that particular.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Five-sixths of the territory of Texas is dry, much the larger proportion, and over half of Nebraska is dry. I want to ask the Senator from Kansas, further, if one of the largest Federal penitentiaries in the United States is not located in Kansas? They send the inmates there from all the whisky States of the Nation. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRISTOW. One of the two Federal penitentiaries that are maintained by the National Government is located at Leavenworth, Kans.; and in addition to that the Kansas penitentiary for many years, until very recently, took care of the convicts in the State of Oklahoma. The State of Oklahoma paid Kansas so much for taking care of her prisoners of that character, and they were confined in the Kansas penitentiary. But I simply say that so far as these statistics are concerned, if they relate simply to the administration of the criminal laws of the States of Nebraska and Kansas, they show that Kansas prosecutes and confines more carefully in prisons the criminal part of her population than does her sister State upon the north.

In this I make no reflection upon the State of Nebraska, because I have quoted no statistics of any kind. I am simply answering allegations that have been made by the Senator from New Jersey, and supported by the Senator from Nebraska, in regard to my own State.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that if the people of Nebraska are more law abiding with the saloon than the people of Kansas are without the saloon, it is a great tribute to the moral qualities of the people of Nebraska, because the Senator from Nebraska knows, and every other Senator in this Chamber knows, that there never was a moral



thought, there never was an idea that worked for the uplifting and betterment of mankind that emanated from a saloon. As an evidence of that fact, all the great business enterprises of this country, as I stated a moment ago, are using every influence within their power to place their employees beyond the influence of the saloon; and I challenge any Senator on this floor to suggest a single good thought, idea, or deed that ever originated in one of those dens of iniquity.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not care to consume the time of the Senate—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to suggest that the number of persons that may be confined in prison is dependent greatly upon the policy of the State as to the prisoner. For instance, in the State of Colorado we have a parole system by which prisoners can earn their liberty, and by giving perfect conduct and by working in the open air on roads and farms a sentence of 10 years can be commuted by their own acts to 4 years and 3 months. That, of course, would have a tendency to decrease the number of persons in the prisons and penitentiary; and the same rule has been applied also to those confined in jails. I do not know what the policy of the State of Kansas may be, or the policy of the State of Nebraska; but evidently one must have a more liberal rule in regard to letting prisoners out than the other.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say that Kansas has a number of penal institutions of a corrective character for men and women. We take the women, the girls, and the boys that are incorrigible and put them in these institutions for the purpose of developing in them the higher ideals of life. Then I desire to say to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Jersey that a very large percentage of the inmates of the jails and the penitentiary of Kansas are there for violating the prohibitory law. Why, there is county after county where there is not anybody in jail except some fellow who has been selling whisky in an illicit way. In Kansas we send to jail the man who sells whisky to poison the morals and the life and the character of his fellow men, and if they violate the statute habitually we send them to the penitentiary to do penal service for their crimes, and a large percentage of the inmates of these institutions have been sent there for violating this law.

Senators, I want to say that the saloon, the sale of intoxicating liquors, is an evil influence in society from which nothing but vice, woe, suffering, and corruption, and for a Senator to state that the presence of a large number of such institutions in his State contributes to the moral uplift of her people is a mistake. You might as well sow seeds of corruption of any other kind in the minds of the youth and then say that it is for his good. You might as well bring any other kind of vice or harbor of the vicious into a community and say it is for its benefit. That is contrary to every principle of moral ethics; it can not be defended.

The State or the community that banishes these dens of vice and iniquity does honor to itself, and the influence which results from such action is for the good of the people of those communities. Such statements are true and axiomatic and can not be denied by any sophistry or argument or presentation of statistics that do not prove what it is hoped that they may prove.

Mr. LANE. I should like to say that I think, respecting the States of Nebraska and Kansas, the Senators from those States have become confused in relation to the statistics. As a matter of fact, in Leavenworth, Kans., a prison for Federal prisoners is located, and the inmates of that institution, I presume, are taken into account in making up these statistical tables. A number of citizens of Nebraska are temporarily residing at this time in the penal institution in Kansas, and that is added to the population. Some citizens of our State of Oregon are included, for I have been interested in getting some of them released from there. It may be that that makes a difference.

Mr. CRAWFORD obtained the floor.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield for just a moment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Inasmuch as so much has been said about Nebraska, I should like to have read from the desk an editorial written by the leading citizen of Nebraska—perhaps in this presence I should say the third leading citizen—on this subject, Mr. Bryan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

#### THE ALCOHOLIC MILLSTONE.

The Democrats of the Nation have an issue to face, and they may as well prepare for it. The liquor interests are at bay; they are on the defensive. They realize that they have but a few more years in which to fatten upon the woes of their victims, but they are fighting desperately and are willing to hold any party between them and the fire. The Democratic Party can not afford to shield the brewery, the distillery, and the saloon from the rising wrath of a determined people. Democracy is the Nation's hope on political and economic questions; let it not, by taking sides with the liquor interests, repel those who put moral issues first. The young men of the country are Democratic by nature, but they will not submit their claims to political preferment to those who conspire against the home and everything good; neither will they find pothouse politicians congenial party associates. The President has set a high standard in intelligence and morals, and the party can not afford to lower the colors to gain a temporary advantage. Those whose support depends upon subservience to the liquor interests disgrace the party while they are with it and then leave it if it refuses to obey them. They are a millstone about the party's neck. The Democratic Party is the party of the future; it has a chance to enter the promised land; why allow the liquor interests to lead it away into the wilderness? Get ready for the fight.

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, I understand that in one sense the discussion of this report is idle, because of the fact that, as construed by the Senate, it will require a two-thirds vote of this body to suspend the rule so that the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas may be considered. But while that is true, Mr. President, there lies back of the immediate question, back of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, a question which has a deep hold upon the American people, and in regard to which I do not believe it is any waste of time to exchange views here upon this floor upon this occasion.

It may be said, of course, that every matter considered by the Senate or by the Congress of the United States is a matter of great interest and of great importance, weighty business; but, Mr. President, when this particular question and its various associated questions come up in any form we at once observe a manifestation of interest that does not attend the deliberation of other matters, and the reason for it is that the interest is profound, is widespread, and reaches into the innermost recesses of the human heart.

I am going out of the Senate in a few weeks. I am going out with a good deal of satisfaction to myself and perhaps a good deal of satisfaction to others. I do not expect to engage in public life nor partisan politics, but to go back to my little home, into my country law office, and resume the practice of the law in the neighborhood where I have lived for a great many years. So for once I feel that what I say can not in the slightest degree be influenced by a desire either to play to these galleries or to shape a course that may win in a selfish way some advantage in the forum of politics. I do not desire to discuss the matter in any dogmatic way or in any spirit of fanaticism; but no question could possibly have come before the Senate of the United States while I have had the honor to be a Member of it that could impress me as being of greater importance to this country in all its future than this question.

I may say right in the start that if this particular question could get before the Senate it would be a proposition for the Congress of the United States to legislate for the people of the District without their being heard in it; but the people of the District would be heard in it just the same as they are heard in regard to legislation of every other character that relates to the District, just the same as they would be heard in any matter of taxation which would take money out of their pockets, just in the same way that they would be heard in relation to any police regulation of any other matter that should be imposed upon them by the Congress of the United States. This Congress is their legislative counsel, their city council, their legislative body, and it has in the very nature of things the same power to enact prohibitive legislation of this character that the legislature of any State has. So I do not believe there is anything affecting a fundamental right that is involved in this claim that we would be legislating in regard to the interests of the people of this District without their having a voice in it. It is the District of Columbia and not the city of Washington. It is under the direct control and supervision and subject to the direct legislative power of the Congress of the United States.

But we hear over and over again that the prohibition of the liquor traffic carried on in these saloons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere is a matter in which people have some sort of constitutional personal right that can not be touched by legislation; that it is a matter of individual habit; and that every man and every woman ought to be built up with a character so strong, with a will so invincible, that they can as individuals protect themselves against these dangers that are everywhere incident to the use of intoxicating liquors.



Oh, my fellow Senators, you have seen here and there during the years of your life admirable brilliant men, endowed with great power, both of mind and of will, and yet you have seen them as little children in the hands of a habit that holds them in its control as a galley slave. What is the use to talk about the individual being able in the strength of his character and his will to control himself when everywhere along the way we see the victims of that class?

Mr. President, when I went to my home just after Congress adjourned at the last session I discovered a situation there that chilled the blood in my veins. I found that the open saloons in the village in which I lived were in a combination and had a sort of net for the boys in the high school. One of them, a nonresident brewer, owned a saloon and employed irresponsible bartenders, and when a cry came up against one he disappeared and another was put in his place. These bartenders were playing the game with the little boys in our high school, having understandings with them that if they came at a certain time down the back alley and to the back door of the saloon they could get not only beer but whisky and carry it off out on the ground back of where they played baseball. Some of those little boys were found drunk more than once.

They went further than that. They had their little club, their little association, where they practically took a solemn vow that they would not expose each other, that they would protect each other if any charge was made about their drinking, and even in their little parties with their sweethearts from the high school some of them were found too drunk to go home with the young girls they had brought there.

Look here, my fellow Senators, your sons under such conditions as these become the victims of a habit. There is where it comes close to home. Your son, whom you expect to bear your name and go into your office and practice the profession you now follow when you are gone, at a time when you have absolute confidence that he is pure, sweet, innocent, and knows nothing about a thing of this kind is forming a habit in these saloons in the plastic years of his life that is reaching down and getting hold of him from which there is no escape.

Suppose it is your boy, all your hope in the world. What do you care for yourself as compared with your boy, your two boys, your three boys? I have three of them. If a thing of this kind should happen to those boys, what would I care, what would their mother care, for life? My boy is not any more to me than any other parent's boy is to him.

So much is said about these mothers that it becomes a sort of cant and falls on listless ears; but the mothers who are at home watching these little children say their prayers before they get into bed at night, who see them taking their first limping little barefooted step out of the front door and afterwards into the school, and watch them grow and develop—what must be their anguish when they discover that just outside the dooryard and beyond the street are these spider webs laid to poison those little lives?

I ask, what in the world do we receive revenues from these institutions for or permit them, so far as we have any power in the matter, to exist for? Say, what good are they? Why is it that we say, even where we license them, "You have got to close up at 9 o'clock at night; you are not allowed to sell liquor to minors; you are not allowed to sell it to habitual drunkards; you are not allowed to keep gambling apparatus inside"? We do not say it to the grocer or any other concern anywhere. Why do we say it to the saloon? Because we admit that it is bad, wholly, entirely, irredeemably bad.

We can not rebuild humanity. That is true. We can not pass laws that make men over again. We can not put a statute on the books that will make a bad man a good man or that will make a particular drunkard a sober man. I admit all that. But we can outlaw the saloons.

How many clerks with small salaries in all these departments, that perhaps have families and have rents to pay, who have children to clothe and have duties to their children and the families to perform, are being led into these pitfalls along the streets here, when they go home from their daily work, and are leaving money there and practically by doing so stealing it away from their children? We are taking part of the money those poor men are paying in there, and of which they are depriving their children and their wives. We are taking part of it in the Treasury to pay the expenses of this Government. Let us look that thing squarely in the face. Is that right? What business have we to be doing such a thing as that?

I will tell you, my dear old brother from New Jersey, what is the matter. The reason why we do not come out and be perfectly fearless about this matter and go at it single hearted to destroy this evil is that we are really sort of fond of this thing. We may take only one drink of whisky occasionally,

but we are fond of it just the same. We may not get it out of the saloon, we may get it in the club, but we rather like it, and we are allowing that partiality for it to influence us. You will find when you get right down to the root of the matter that that is where the reason is found for all this sluggish indifference to it. It is in some way or another, financially or personally, they are in it in sympathy or as a business proposition.

I tell you it is a serious thing. I know they say in Maine it has been tried so many years, and we have never got it clear out of there yet. That is true.

I was in Iowa just out of law school when they voted for State-wide constitutional prohibition. It went into the courts and it was defeated. Then in the State in which I live and into which I went as a young lawyer we voted State-wide prohibition into our constitution. We tried it for 10 years. We had a few counties in the State that were so solidly composed of men from foreign lands, who believed that it was just as proper and just as much their right and privilege to drink beer as it was to drink coffee, that it was not enforced there, and that put it into discredit, and after 10 years it was voted out of the constitution and we enacted a local-option law. Each county coming in under the local option has increased the number until in a substantial way we are rapidly becoming State-wide prohibition again; and now that the men of foreign birth, who stuck to their customs and habits so strongly, are passing away, their sons and daughters, who have been educated in the public schools, who have got inspiration from our churches, who have been taught these prohibitory doctrines, are now becoming prohibitionists, and I expect in no distant day to see the State which I in part represent become again a State-wide prohibition State.

Now, what right have the breweries and the distilleries in different cities and States in this Union to ask us to allow them to prey upon the growing boys and girls of this country in order to put money into their pockets? Oh, let us look at this thing as it is. I went into one of those big hotels down in Chicago one night about 1 o'clock in the morning when there was a great convention held there, and to see the red liquor that not only men but women were pouring down in almost unlimited quantities was a fright.

You can go into some of these cities and find a poor mother with a little child at her breast lying in her filth on the floor drunk. Then do you talk to me about the distillation that you get out of grain and corn and rice as something that the Lord made for the benefit of mankind? You had better say that we ought to permit the use of opium because the Lord made the poppy, and let people take it without limit. No! No!

I simply take the opportunity to say that in the few years I have left, when I vote on this question, wherever it comes, whether at the polling booth in my little town or here or elsewhere, I am going to vote in the direction that means that ultimately, so far as the law can do so, this business is going to be outlawed. I am going to vote that way here and now.

Mr. STONE obtained the floor.

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment before he begins his address?

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to have read by the Secretary a statement from Hon. John S. Dawson, the retiring attorney general of Kansas, who on last Monday retired as attorney general and was sworn in as a member of the supreme court of our State. Since Kansas has been referred to quite extensively, I should like to have that statement of Mr. Dawson's read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

#### RESULTS OF PROHIBITION IN KANSAS.

[By Hon. John S. Dawson, attorney general.]

In 30 years Kansas has forged ahead from an insignificant place in national affairs to one of front rank. Almost a third of the entire population is enrolled in public or private schools. We have \$16,000,000 worth of school buildings and public endowment funds of \$10,000,000 more. Illiteracy has been reduced to less than 2 per cent, and that trifling amount is almost entirely among the foreign element in our mining regions of the southeast.

With 105 counties in the State, 87 of them have no insane, 54 have no feeble-minded, 96 have no inebriates, and the few we do have come from the cities which defied the law to the very last. Thirty-eight county poor farms have no inmates. Only one pauper to every three thousand population. In July, 1911, 53 county jails were empty; 65 counties had no prisoners serving sentence. Some counties have not called a jury to try a criminal case in 10 years, and a grand jury is so uncommon that half of our people wouldn't know what it is. In my home county in western Kansas there has never been but one grand jury in its history and that was 25 years ago.

In 1880, when prohibition was adopted, Kansas was an exceedingly poor State. In 30 years it has become the richest State in the Union per capita. The assessed valuation of property for taxation is sufficient



to give every man, woman, and child in the State \$1,700. The average wealth in the Nation is only \$1,200.

Prior to 1880 the death rate in Michigan and Wisconsin, Iowa and Kansas, was practically the same, viz, 17 to the thousand. After 30 years of prohibition in Kansas our death rate has dropped to 7½, while that of the other States has slightly increased. Is it not fair to say that 30 years of prohibition had something to do with this?

In 1880 the bank-savings deposits were \$30,000,000; to-day they are \$200,000,000.

Prohibition has taken politics out of the saloons and has driven the saloon out of politics.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I would not detain the Senate, anxious as I am to expedite business, except that I am unwilling that a vote should be taken on the question pending without saying a word in protest against the attitude taken by most, if not all, the Senators who have spoken in favor of the adoption of the committee report.

Mr. President, if I should judge men by their intemperate utterances, I might imagine that some of those who have indulged in such ferocity of expression to-day had taken something even into their mouths which had stolen away their brains. Alcohol is not the only thing that steals away a man's intellect. Narrowness of mental vision, intolerance, bigotry—things of that kind embedded in the hearts and minds of men—often makes them think they are superior to their fellows, better at heart and infallible in judgment, when, in fact, these characteristics merely impair a man's capacity to think clearly, to speak temperately, or to conduct himself in a spirit of fairness and justice to others.

Mr. President, this debate has proceeded upon a false assumption. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], and others assume to arraign those of us who are opposed to prohibition as being the advocates and friends of the saloon. They would have the country believe that we stand for the saloon; that we are its friends and champions. I do not think that that is a very creditable statement for any Senator to make. It is not creditable to his sense or his veracity. I can only say that the man who is capable of making that charge, especially in the circumstances of this environment, must be a very narrow sort of human creature—narrow in the scope and possibilities of his intellect and both narrow and absurd in the assumption of superior virtue, morality, and good citizenship.

Mr. President, I do not believe in prohibition as a national policy or as an arbitrary State-wide policy. I would vote against Nation-wide prohibition, as I did speak and vote against an amendment to our State constitution establishing State-wide prohibition. That constitutional amendment was before the people of Missouri three or four years ago, and the proposition was defeated by a vote approximately of 250,000. Following my convictions, I voted against it, but I did not impugn the motives or integrity of those who voted for it. If a majority of my fellow citizens had been of the opinion that it was a policy that should be adopted by the State, and if it had been written into our constitution, no man would have more earnestly insisted upon its enforcement than I.

I think a State has a right, under the Constitution, to determine all police questions of that kind for itself, and if the people of my State should at any time take a different view from that I entertain I would accept their judgment and thenceforth stand with them for the enactment of such laws as might be needful to carry out that policy and stand with them for the enforcement of the law. I would not, however, seek to force that policy by Federal enactment upon another State.

In my State I took the position that the exclusion of licensed places for the sale of intoxicating liquors should be determined by local option in each community acting for itself. That is the present policy of the State, and I think it is the wiser one. More than half the counties of the State have adopted what we call "local option," and saloons are not permitted. As a rule, I think the law in those counties is well enforced, due to the fact that in those counties the law is supported by public opinion. I have not thought that one county should force its views and policies upon the people of another county where an entirely different public opinion prevails. If the shoe should be put upon the other foot, I would undoubtedly oppose any effort that might be attempted by those we call the "wets" to establish a policy that would make it possible to maintain saloons in counties where the people are opposed to them. I would have each community settle that question for itself, and especially would I let each State settle it for itself. States are supposed to be sovereign over matters which purely and solely affect their internal concerns, and I think that the States severally should remain sovereign over all police questions of this character. Moreover, I stand for a measure—a large measure—of individual liberty. Individual liberty is an old principle which always appeals to me.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] spoke about what the Czar had done in Russia. He put a new jewel in the crown of the Czar because he had with one sweep of his pen driven the demon, as he called it, from the Empire. Mr. President, I do not adopt the Czar of Russia as my model or my example. To be sure, he could of his own motion and by his own decree forbid the manufacture, sale, or use of intoxicants, or perhaps of anything, within the limits of his vast Empire. So he might by his decree determine what his subjects—his subjects, I say—might not eat, or what they might or might not wear, or what professions they might or might not be permitted to engage in. That sort of thing is done in Russia. So, also, may the Czar of all the Russias decree what men may not think, controlling not only the habits of men, but the minds of men, and make it a crime to think. Thousands have been chained like brutes and whipped from their homes into the chill and lonely confinement of Siberian solitudes because of the things they dared to think. Let these subjects have thoughts that reached out toward liberty—individual or collective human liberty; let it be known that they aspired to something better than this autocrat was willing they should have, and it has never been long until, like slaves, they have been driven at night from the toll of quarries to the most cheerless of dungeons. I hate intolerance in any form, no matter how or where or when it appears. No, Mr. President, the Czar of the Russias affords no inspiration to me.

I am sorry to find Senators so inconsiderate, narrow, intolerant, and bigoted as to charge motives upon and against their colleagues on this floor that are discreditable to them solely because they do not agree with them. I am unable to understand that temperament or mental construction.

Mr. President, I am not the advocate, champion, or friend of the saloon; but I do believe with all my might that better results from every point of view, whether of sobriety or good order or good morals, are attained through a strict regulatory system than through absolute prohibition, unless the attempt at prohibition is sanctioned and supported by a decided public sentiment.

I know thousands of good men and women do not agree to this view; I know there are in my State, as in yours, thousands among the best of our people who are so intense in their opposition to the liquor traffic that they have persuaded themselves into the belief that the only effective remedy is to destroy the saloon; and not only the saloon, but to destroy even the manufacture and sale in any form of all kinds of alcoholic beverages. I do not criticize, much less assail, these good people. God only knows they may be right; I do not know that they are wrong, but I do not think they are right. The best thought I have leads me to a view wholly at variance with theirs. There are among them, as I have said, many men and women who go so deeply into the struggle and become so intense in their feelings that they grow to be absolutely intolerant of other men and women who do not think as they do. They seem to regard it as impossible that anybody could have an honest opinion on this subject contrary to theirs, and they are too quick to believe that whoever differs from them is influenced by some foul motive—not only a mistaken view, but a foul motive. There are so many intent upon attributing bad motives or purposes to men and women who do not agree with them. I wish that were not so. Happily it is not true of thousands, but it is true of many; and it is true of some not far away who ought to know better. I have no tolerance for intolerance, no patience with this spirit of illiberality.

Mr. President, a word more and I am done. If the people want prohibition, let them have it. If they want it, I want them to have it; and where you find a community where there is a dominant sentiment favorable to prohibition you will have a community where it would be in every way good for the people to have prohibition, and in such a community there will rarely be any trouble about enforcing a prohibitory statute. As to this particular measure, applying only to the District of Columbia, I do not believe that prohibition would promote sobriety, good order, or good morals in this District.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STONE. That is my opinion, I suppose, possibly, the Senator from Texas rises to say that I am now speaking for the saloons in Washington; but I am not. He is laboring under a grave misapprehension.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; but the practical effect of the Senator's speech is for the saloons. That, however, was not what I rose to say. I want to know if the Senator was in favor of abolishing the sale of liquor in the Capitol Building?



Mr. STONE. Yes; and it has been long since abolished.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you no confidence in the ability of Senators and Representatives to drink or not to drink without the interference of prohibitory law? What becomes of your argument against the merit of prohibition?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, as between the Capitol and the city there is no parallel. And now, when I say that, I see some of my prohibition friends smile; but men "may smile and smile" and—well, I will not finish the quotation; it would not be proper—but a man may smile and smile and still be mistaken. [Laughter.] A mere grin upon a face, however well shaven, placid or even classic in contour, does not help the intellect to right conclusions. A supercilious sneer is not a convincing proof of good judgment.

Mr. President, the Senator says that the effect of my argument is to favor saloons. Not so. Saloons may remain, indeed, if the argument should be effective. I think undoubtedly they would remain, although, speaking out of my heart, I wish there were none in the world. I wish there were no intoxicants on earth and that none were used by men as beverages. But it is not what I wish; the question is what I should do to get the best result out of conditions as they are.

No, I do not speak for the saloons. I believe, absolutely believe, that if my argument should have weight and my advice be followed it would result in far better conditions in the District than could, in the circumstances, be hoped for under prohibition.

This Capitol is the Capitol of the Nation. It is the building where the lawmaking power assembles—

Mr. WILLIAMS. They do not allow even photographs to be sold in the Capitol.

Mr. KERN. The Capitol building is not a hotel.

Mr. STONE. The Capitol is not a hotel. It is the National Capitol, and no traffic of any kind should be permitted under its roof, except it be absolutely essential to the convenient transaction of business by the Senate and House of Representatives. We need restaurants in the Senate and in the House, but that is to facilitate the business of Congress by aiding in economizing the time of Senators and Representatives. But we do not need a saloon in the Capitol, and there is none. We do not want whisky dispensed publicly here in this building, and it will not be done; but there are reasons for that outside of and beyond the reasons that influenced my judgment when I come to deal with the government of a great city like this—a city of perhaps 350,000 people—to which thousands are ever coming from all over the country and all over the world. I believe that better results will be attained here without this proposed law than with it. I have that opinion, and it does not become any Senator to assail my motives. I might speak in more resentful terms of that sort of thing if I cared enough about it, but such observations do not ordinarily flow from a source that I consider of sufficient importance to weigh heavily upon my heart. I am satisfied to protest against it and pass it by. Now, Mr. President, I am through—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. What I rose for especially was to enter my protest against this question being decided upon the pleadings made by the friends of the measure. The issue they present is a false one. I shall not vote against this amendment because I am the friend of the saloon, but I shall vote against it because I believe the welfare of the people of this city will be better promoted by a well-regulated license system than by what would be, as I think, a vain attempt to prevent the sale and use of intoxicants altogether.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Missouri has not discussed the question which, to my mind, is perhaps of most importance in this matter, and that is as to what the attitude of the people of the District themselves may be with reference to it.

The Senator has in his own State a local-option law, as we have in the State which I in part represent. The value of that law, as it occurs to me, is that no community undertakes to put prohibition into operation until a majority of the community are in favor of it; and whenever a majority of a particular community are in favor of the enforcement of the law, and so declares, they can make it measurably successful. The extent of the success will depend upon the strength of the sentiment in favor of the law; but the weakness of the State-wide idea is that it undertakes to put prohibition into operation in communities where the majority are against prohibition just the same as it does in communities where the majority are in favor

of it; and the enforcement of a law of this kind, more than any other sort of law, depends upon the sentiment of the community where the law is to be enforced.

I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he has any idea as to what the sentiment of the people of this District is upon that subject, and to ask him, if it should turn out that 65 or 70 or 75 per cent of the intelligent people of this District or of this city are against prohibition, what he thinks as to the possibility of enforcing the law.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not know what the sentiment of the people living in Washington is. I have no means of knowing. I saw in the press that the Chamber of Commerce had a meeting the other day at which it adopted a resolution against this proposed measure. That is the leading commercial body of this city. It represents the industrial and commercial activities of the community. That is the only expression I have seen beyond expressions I have read in the newspapers.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a slight interruption just at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have here a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., which, if I may be permitted, I will read:

We, the Chamber of Commerce of the District of Columbia, in annual meeting assembled, protest against prohibition of the licensed sale of liquors in the District of Columbia, comprehended in the Sheppard amendment to the District appropriation act now pending in the Senate. We submit that under any circumstances such drastic organic legislation should have full and separate consideration in Congress. We protest against legislation for the District of Columbia, in which the people of the District have no voice, being considered in riders to appropriation acts. We respectfully petition the Senate of the United States to reject the Sheppard amendment.

Mr. STONE. What is that?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. This is a resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., on January 12, 1915.

Mr. STONE. I have read it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Asking the pardon of the Senator further, here is a statement addressed to the Congress of the United States signed "Respectfully, the Washington Mercantile Association"; and while on my feet I respectfully ask permission that this may be added to the few remarks I made some time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be taken.

The matter referred to is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: Committees of Congress have received protests against attempts to enact more drastic liquor laws for the District of Columbia from the following:

The Personal Liberty League of the District of Columbia, with a petition of residents and taxpayers numbering about 50,000.

The German-American Building Association of this District, with \$1,000,000 capital and 3,000 members, all of these taxpayers in the District of Columbia, protesting against any change in the existing law.

The Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C.

The United German Societies of the District of Columbia.

The Hotel Men's Association of the District of Columbia.

Various fraternal and beneficial organizations of the District of Columbia.

The outing clubs of the District of Columbia.

The Washington Sick Relief Association.

The German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia.

Arminius Lodge, No. 25, Free and Accepted Masons, of the District of Columbia.

The Columbia Ice Co.

Veterans of the Eighth Battalion of the District of Columbia.

William Tell Lodge, No. 5, Independent Order Knights of Pythias, of the District of Columbia.

The Concordia Circle of the District of Columbia.

The Bakers' Benevolent Association of the District of Columbia.

German Beneficial Union of the District of Columbia.

Norwegian Society of the District of Columbia.

Petitions from lawyers, doctors, druggists, cigar dealers, clothiers, furniture dealers, liverymen, second-hand dealers, real estate firms, German-American societies, and letters from men and women residing and paying taxes in the District, including ministers of the gospel.

On two different occasions in the last six years petitions bearing more than 50,000 signatures of adults in the District of Columbia were presented to the District Committee of the United States Senate, asking that they not be weighed down with prohibition.

The Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia passed this resolution:

"Whereas the Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia since 1908 has recorded itself against prohibition and other measures before the Congress of the United States affecting the present excise laws; and

"Whereas we believe that the proper enforcement of the present laws covering the liquor traffic are sufficient and satisfactory to our needs and requirements: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That our legislative committee be instructed to appear before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for the purpose of informing the said committee that organized labor is opposed to the contemplated changes of the present law."



And the official executive heads of the District of Columbia, after a careful examination of the matter, made an unfavorable report on the 27th of March last. The commissioners in this report stated they were of the opinion that if an election were to be held in the District, the majority would vote against any restriction of the number of bar-rooms to a maximum less than the number now in existence. Statistics show, they pointed out, that, while the population of the District has increased more than 60,000 in the past 13 years, there has been no increase in the number of saloons. The Jones-Works bill would limit the number of saloons in Washington to 300. At present there are 498 retail drinking establishments in the Capital and 123 wholesale liquor houses. In lieu of the Jones-Works bill the commissioners recommended a measure limiting the number of saloons to the number now in existence and providing for an increase in the retail license from \$800 to \$1,000, and in the wholesale license from \$400 to \$500, now \$1,500 for retail and \$800 for wholesale.

The annual report for the past 10 years of the excise board shows that less than 1 per cent of the licensed liquor dealers of the District of Columbia have violated the excise law.

On February 21, at the Willard Hotel, on the occasion of the dinner to the President of the United States by the citizens of Washington, D. C., President Taft said, among other things:

"My friends in Washington, it is 23 years since I came to this city; during that entire period my interest has been active, etc.

"I have been here for the last nine years continuously. I believe I have been in a position to know, etc.

"I do not know any better policed city than the city of Washington. I do not know any city in which there has been less vice and in which the Sunday laws and the liquor laws are better observed than they are here.

"Of course, there is not a city in the world where, if a man has got a nose for something nasty, he can not find it. What I mean by this is that Washington is as moral as any city in the world."

We believe, you who have lived here any length of time, agree with the President of the United States in his statement about conditions here in the Nation's Capital, and we sincerely trust you will not only carefully consider what has been said by these high authorities, but to also bear in mind there has been no demand by the people who live here the year round for any change in the present excise law.

This editorial appeared in the Washington Times of January 11, 1915:

#### "A DRY WASHINGTON."

"Whether Washington is to be a dry town is likely to depend on whether somebody makes a point of order in the United States Senate. After that it may depend on whether somebody else insists that the Senate itself vote on the point of order, rather than allow a presiding officer to rule on it.

"Does Washington want prohibition? That is quite immaterial. Nobody seems to have thought seriously of asking the question.

"It is merely a question whether Members of Congress want Washington to have prohibition.

"Not even a question whether Members of Congress want prohibition for their own homes. Just a question whether it would be better politics for them to favor or oppose it for a people who are not their constituents.

"Here is a question on which the rule everywhere is to let the people decide for themselves. One State votes for it, another against it. But Washington, alone of American communities, may get it without even a suggestion of effort to determine how the affected community feels.

"There could be no better illustration of the unrepresentative character of the government that is imposed on this town.

"Whether Washington shall or shall not have such a revolutionary change should be a question for the people of Washington, and nobody else, to decide. But the last people who will get a chance to decide—under present conditions of the local government—are the ones who must live here.

"If Washington wants to go dry, it should have the privilege. But it should not have that policy imposed on it by Congress without a chance for local opinion to be heard."

Respectfully,

THE WASHINGTON MERCANTILE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES. I want to refer for just a moment to the first resolution read.

Mr. STONE. I wanted to go on somewhat further, but I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I simply want to refer to the resolution read by the Senator from New Jersey and to say that, according to the newspaper reports, that resolution was presented and urged by Mr. Harvey. Mr. Harvey is the representative of the saloons of the country and is now running a saloon in the city of Washington under a license issued contrary to law.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no knowledge in regard to that. The Senator is better acquainted as to that than I am.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I know nothing about you prepared the resolution or anything about its origin. I read the resolution in one of the Washington papers, and it was said to have been passed by the chamber of commerce. I do not know what the sentiment of the people is. I have some vague idea with respect to that, but not sufficient definite knowledge or information upon which to base an opinion.

Mr. President, as to whether there should be a reference of this question by election to the people of the District I am not certain, and therefore I express no opinion upon it at this time. I suppose Congress has the absolute power to pass such a law as this. We come here from all over the Union, from every State. We are in and out; we come and go; many of us are

sent here for a few months only and then we are gone for good. We know little about the District as a rule, little of its real conditions or its needs. Let us brush the people aside. Let us say that they have not any rights that we are bound to respect. Then what? As I see it, speaking as one of their legislators—though I live more than a thousand miles from here—but speaking in my capacity as a legislator, it is my deliberate opinion that the best interests of the people living here and of the thousands who come every year for a day or a week would be better protected and cared for and that the general welfare would be better promoted by the system we now have than by the one the Senator from Texas and his confrères are proposing.

That will be my reason for voting as I shall vote on this matter. I do not like to have some other reason or motive ascribed to me or ascribed to other Senators who are going to vote against this proposed amendment. I voted against prohibition in my State, and took all the hazard of that vote, if hazard there was. I might have dodged, Mr. President; but I did not. I might have resorted to some means of staying out of the fight; but I did not. My convictions upon the subject were deliberately formed, and I felt that I ought to take my part in the responsibility of determining what the policy of that great Commonwealth should be with respect to a question of so much importance. So I feel here to-day, and so I shall act upon this question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, while I was out of the Chamber the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] referred to the effect of prohibition in Georgia. I have a copy of the language which he used and I will read it:

I am opposed to prohibition because wherever it has been tried it has proved a failure. I say in the State of South Carolina it is an absolute failure; I say in Georgia it is a failure.

I do not claim that the prohibition law in Georgia is never violated. Few laws are found upon the statute books which are not sometimes violated. There are in Georgia 150 counties. Out of that number certain in 145 counties the law is vigorously enforced. Probably this is true of 147 of the counties. I believe the law has been a blessing to the people of the State. I believe the overwhelming majority of the people of the State favor its retention. It was passed by the legislature during the summer of 1907, more than seven and a half years ago. There has been no serious effort to repeal it. It was made a State issue two years ago last summer by a candidate for governor—an excellent man, a man who had been upon the bench, a popular man. There were three candidates running. Two of them favored the retention of State-wide prohibition. One championed a return to local option. He ran a poor third.

I do not desire to speak upon this subject, and I should not have risen except for the fact that I think it is due to the earnest advocates of prohibition in my own State that I should say this much in reply to the statement of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WORKS obtained the floor.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in justification—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has the floor. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I beg the Senator's pardon. I will not interrupt him.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the immediate matter before the Senate is the question of the suspension of the rules; but back of it is a great moral question, and one that the Congress of the United States will be called upon to determine sooner or later, and in my judgment it will be very soon.

The saloon, or the liquor traffic, has found no champion or defender up to this time in this debate on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], while opposing prohibition, objects to being classed as the friend or the champion of the saloon. It is acknowledged to be a great evil—so great an evil that the Supreme Court of the United States has determined that it may not only be regulated by law, but may be completely destroyed, notwithstanding the fact that it may indirectly amount to confiscation of the property of those who are dealing in the traffic.

The question presented here, aside from that of the suspension of the rules, is a very simple one. Are we going to continue to license and indorse and legalize the traffic in intoxicating liquors, or are we going to destroy it?

The trouble about it is that too many of the people of this country, and particularly the business men, attempt to make it a matter of dollars and cents; but it rises far above that, Mr. President. It is a question that goes to the morals, to the character, and the integrity of the people of the United States.



It is hardly necessary in this presence to undertake to point out the evils of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. There is not a man on the floor of the Senate who does not know and recognize the fact, and admit it. The only question is whether there is some better way of dealing with this question than the absolute prohibition of the traffic.

It is said that prohibition does not prohibit. It is said by some of the business men that it hurts business. On the part of others, it is said that it is an interference with personal liberty. These are matters of small consequence as compared with the great evil itself and the consequences and results from the sale and use of intoxicating liquors.

Let us apply it, as we are expected to do by our votes on this occasion, if this amendment should be adopted, to the District of Columbia. Does any Senator mean to say that the power of this great Nation, which has complete jurisdiction over these 10 miles square of territory, can not control the liquor traffic and enforce a law prohibiting it if we shall enact it? Who shall say that it is better for this country, even if it were an admitted fact that business is benefited by this traffic that it should be improved at the expense of the morals and standing and integrity of the people of this country, and that the claim that it hurts business should be a valid objection to the enactment of legislation of this kind? But no thinking man who has knowledge of the facts and conditions will maintain for a moment that prohibition does hurt business.

In my own State there are prosperous and growing cities, the most prosperous in the State, that are prohibition cities. Take the great city of Pasadena, one of the most prosperous and growing cities in this whole country. It is a prohibition city. So is the city of Long Beach, on the coast, in Los Angeles County. It has grown in a few years to a population of something like 40,000 people. It has not hindered its growth, it has not interfered with business, but it has made the city grow and prosper beyond any other near-by city along the coast.

I do not question the motives of Senators or anybody else who oppose prohibition. It is a matter that has been one of controversy and debate for years. I wish, however, to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the sentiment in favor of prohibition in this country has grown by leaps and bounds. It has become almost a revolution. If this matter were submitted to the people of the District of Columbia, and all of the people who are interested in that question, including the women, were allowed to vote, in my judgment there would be no question as to the result. Prohibition would be voted, I am certain, by the people of this District; and, so far as I am individually concerned, I should be very glad to see the whole matter submitted to the people of the District of Columbia to determine this great question that so vitally affects their interests. That may be impracticable. All of the machinery of the election and the casting and counting of the votes would have to be provided by law in order to allow any expression of opinion on this question. If it were practicable, I for one would be perfectly willing to allow the whole question to be submitted to the people themselves.

I know it is unnecessary to cite instances or cases of the fearful effects of the sale and use of intoxicating liquors; but I should like to call the attention of the Senate to just one case that has come within my knowledge, and is typical of a great many others that have happened as a result of the traffic.

I knew a lawyer in my native State of Indiana. He was a great lawyer, a man of ability, a bright, intelligent, successful lawyer, a popular man. He had as many friends, perhaps, as any man in the community. In the beginning it used to make him brighter, more brilliant, to take a little intoxicating liquor; but it was not very long until the habit had fastened itself upon him, and I lived to see him walking the streets unkempt, ragged, and almost idiotic. His friends contributed in small amounts to keep him from want. He finally found a little place to live in a poor, dingy room in the upper story of a small building in the little town where he lived, with a flight of stairs on the outside. He reached the point where, in a drunken condition, he fell down the stairway and was killed. It was a sad end to a promising and useful life that was completely wrecked by strong drink.

What amount of money, what amount of successful business, can compensate for results like that? And his is not a single case, by any means. There are thousands of cases of that sort happening all over this country to-day as a result of this traffic.

I appeal to the Senate to allow this question to come to a vote, in order that Senators may express their views upon it and, if a majority of the Senate are in favor of legislation of this kind, that they may have the opportunity to pass this

amendment. It can be defeated, not by a vote upon its merits, not by a majority vote, but by the enforcement of this rule by a vote of one-third of the Senators. That, I think, would be a misfortune. It would be simply delaying a vote that must come sooner or later on this measure. I think, for the good of the District of Columbia, for the good of this whole Nation, resulting from the example that will be given by us to-day, it would be well for us in this instance to suspend the rule and allow the Senate to express its views upon the merits of this question.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I do not feel willing to be silent when a question of this national importance is before the Senate, and for that reason I pray the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments to express my opinion in regard to it.

I favor prohibition, Nation-wide, State-wide, and local option, in order of preference, and certainly within the District of Columbia I wish the liquor traffic expelled. In my own State, for three-quarters of a century, under a two-thirds vote of the Senate, prohibition has been imposed by treaties with the various Five Civilized Tribes of Indians. When the State of Oklahoma was established in 1907 the people of the State made it a State-wide issue, discussed it thoroughly from end to end of the State, and decided that it was better for the people of Oklahoma to have prohibition. It resulted in some destruction of property. It resulted in some serious loss to men who had built up breweries and liquor business under the laws in western Oklahoma, and those who had established such business were compelled to give up the traffic. It was prophesied that Oklahoma City, our capital, would be greatly injured by prohibition; that the places that were occupied by saloons would not be easily occupied by other business. The contrary proved to be the fact. Immediately that prohibition went into effect these places were all occupied by legitimate business. It has had a good effect in our State, in our cities, and in our country districts, and the State on various occasions has tested its own opinion and has refused to go back to the previous system.

I am opposed to the liquor traffic generally, not only because of the evil effects of alcohol on the human organism, on the physical strength and powers of a man, but because of its evil effect upon his brain power, its evil effect upon his moral character. When a man becomes addicted to alcohol, when its poison penetrates his blood, it is a progressive poison under the law governing toxins. It is useless to say a man can quit if he wants to. The trouble is he can not want to. He becomes a victim of the habit.

I am opposed to the liquor traffic because I have observed that they do not hesitate to establish grogeries of the lowest character, with attendant houses of vice. They become centers of nefarious political activity. They group every evil element in a city and use those evil elements to promote their wicked and sinister influence in the government of the cities and throughout the States. They do not hesitate to undertake to control membership in the United States Senate. Evidence has been put before the Committee on Privileges and Elections of this body within the last week offering to show the expenditure of hundred of thousands of dollars in the last election by these evil elements with a view to controlling the membership of this body.

I think the time has come when we should no longer encourage or permit a traffic which has distinguished itself as centers of vice, as centers of political corruption, a traffic which has shown itself so defiant of the law and of honest public opinion.

When you say that you can not enforce the prohibition law you mean to say that these evil elements are so defiant of the law, are so persistent in their defiance of the law, that even the sovereign power of the Government of the United States is unable to deal with it. When it comes to an issue of that character I am in favor of grappling with the force that defies the law and defies public opinion and determine where the sovereignty is, whether with God's people or with the commercialized agents of Satan.

There is another aspect. Many great properties have been built up under the sanction of the law. We have tremendous breweries in many of our great cities, with property valued at millions and millions of dollars, and naturally these men and men who are engaged in the wholesale liquor traffic are concerned not only in conserving the business which they have built up under the sanction and permission of law, but they are also ready to commercialize this traffic and enlarge their own private holdings by sending liquor into prohibition territory. They have done this over and over again, to such a degree that in my own State it has become a very great evil in some of the cities, particularly in the city of Tulsa, where recently two of



the deputy marshals sent by order of the Government to search the premises of a notorious bootlegger were deliberately shot down and murdered. So strong was this liquor interest in that city that it was impossible to convict that man, and the United States district attorney withdrew from the case because, he alleged, it was being conducted as a farce. The evil influence of this traffic permeates, penetrates, and poisons government and even the fountain of justice.

I think the time has come when the people of the United States should consider the absolute destruction of the liquor traffic, and in doing so to deal with it in a spirit of temperance and of moderation. I should be perfectly willing to agree to compensate those men for the property which would be destroyed. I think it is better to adjust it upon such lines than to have the struggle proceed in so fierce a fashion and continued so long by those who are fearful of this great loss of property. Paying for the breweries, paying for the liquor interest and buying it out, would be better for the Republic, just as it would have been better for this Nation if the people of the Nation had agreed to settle black slavery by paying the price of the slaves and freeing them on that basis. Civil War was too high a price to pay, and the war which society wages on the liquor traffic, and the cost to society in the administration of justice, in punishing the crimes and misdemeanors due to the liquor traffic is greater than would be the cost of buying out the liquor business bodily.

I asked only a few moments of the time of the Senate. I do not wish to discuss this matter at any length. Every Senator here knows this question on one side and on the other side by heart. It is as old as the hills. The arguments can be marshaled on either side with perfect facility by any Senator on this floor. As for myself, I am in favor of prohibition, State wide, Nation wide, and certainly for the District in which the capital of this Nation is located, in order that we may give a testimonial to the people of the United States as to the attitude of the Senate and the House of Representatives on this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suppose the world will be a thousand years older and human nature will have to be changed very much before men ever discuss any great public question concerning which they have a great deal of feeling without, consciously or unconsciously, going to great extremes and, consciously or unconsciously, being guilty of falsehoods. Both extremes of this question illustrate that fact.

Not long ago I picked up the utterance of a very distinguished prohibitionist, and he mentioned the fact that a certain number of people in America went to their graves each year from the liquor habit. It struck me as an enormous number of people, and I thought maybe I had better look into it, and I found out that alcohol, by his account, had sent to their graves in America about 100,000 more people than had in that year died in all America. That is an illustration of the extremes to which men go on one side.

A further illustration of it is that men picture to you a condition under prohibitory laws as if the millennium were coming if you merely got rid of alcoholic stimulants. Asia Minor has been rid of alcoholic stimulants since a little while after a thousand years after Christ. Since Mohammed and his followers, with the sword in one hand and the Koran—prohibiting the use of alcoholic stimulants, even light wine—in the other. Asia Minor has set no great example for the world's imitation. Of course a man would be just as great an extremist to cite that as a reason why prohibition could not do good somewhere else as he would be to make the assertion that prohibition might bring some sort of a millennium.

Mr. President, this philosophic fact is true, that a man who is not a drunkard merely because he can not procure something wherewith to be drunk is precisely as much a drunkard as if he were lying in the gutter drunk. A man who shoots at me with the intent of murdering me and fails to accomplish his purpose because his pistol is not loaded or the hammer fails to fall is, in the eyes of God, just as much a murderer as if he killed me. Vice and virtue are inward, not outward, things. God judges by the nature of the soul.

But that does not conclude the question. That is an extreme utterance, too.

Because it is also true that there are very many people in the world who have no desire nor intent nor inner inclination to become drunkards and who have no desire nor intent to commit murder and who yet might be led into one or the other by a temptation extreme or irresistible for them. So much for the extremes upon one side of this question. Moreover, man can not see the inner intent, and must judge by the outward overt act.

Christianity did not teach prohibition. Mohammedanism did; and thus far the Christian nations of the world are not behind the Mohammedans either in civilization or in intellectual ability or industrial progress. That is not, however, because the one permitted the use of liquor and the other did not, and the man who argues either side of that proposition is necessarily also an extremist.

Now, upon the other side; if a man should rise in his place here and say that one State is the superior of another, and has fewer illiterates and fewer convicts and fewer insane than another, because the first State attempts to stop the sale of liquor and the latter does not, he is equally guilty of an extreme utterance.

I did not intend to say anything upon this question. I expected to let my vote on the resolution and amendment proposed to it speak for me. I must, however, now say something because of the fact that I have ascertained that I can not procure a transfer of my pair, and therefore there will be no other way than by speech for me satisfactorily to carry my opinion to my constituents.

In the first place, I shall vote for this motion of the Senator from Texas to suspend the rules and to pass his resolution. In the second place, I shall vote to refer the question to the people of the District of Columbia. If the motion to refer it, the referendum, is defeated, I shall still vote for the motion to suspend and to close the saloons in the District of Columbia.

Now, I want to give in a very few words my reasons for it.

In the first place, Mr. President, regardless of my individual views upon this great subject, this is a representative government, and no man has a right, except in very exceptional cases, to stand upon this floor or upon the floor of the other House and knowingly misrepresent his constituents, or if he does it he ought to lay down his office and give it back to them who gave it to him and ask a fresh vote of confidence. There are just a few exceptions to that rule. A man's constituents have no right to call upon him to violate the Constitution of the United States, because that is to violate his oath. His constituents have no right to call upon him to do that which in his opinion is immoral or unethical, because there they would call upon him to violate his duty to God. His constituents have no right to call upon him to do that which shall endanger international peace, because that is to violate the first law of the Prince of Peace.

With those three exceptions, this is a representative and not a misrepresentative Government. If I had no opinion upon this question different from that of my constituents, I should not hold my seat here in the name of the State of Mississippi and misrepresent her; and Mississippi has indicated her will upon this subject beyond all peradventure of a doubt; not once, but several times.

Independently of that, I would vote for it, anyhow. Years ago I opposed prohibition in my own State, believing that it would do no good. But, Mr. President, it has done good, especially among the negroes. I do not indorse the principle that you have a right to make other people do good by law, but the argument that prohibition does no good can hold no longer, at least in my State. In large towns where people are opposed to it it is not enforced. In country precincts it is enforced. There are acres after acres of the soil of Mississippi to-day where no man could get a drink for love or money unless he got it at the house of some friend, at his sideboard or table.

Now, I am as great an advocate of the independent development and self-evolution of the individual man as there is on this floor, or perhaps in the world. I do not believe that God permitted sin and suffering in this world for no reason at all, and I believe that his reason was that men might develop their muscles in the face of moral difficulty and obstruction and temptation, just as they develop their physical muscles in the face of physical difficulty and obstructions.

But, Mr. President, there are some exceptions to the rule of leaving men subject to temptation in order that they may grow strong. Every one of us admits the exception when we do not permit either poison or opiates to be sold ad libitum.

If I had my own way—and I have not and I never expect to have it—both extremes would equally decry me and put me down on every side. I would absolutely forbid the sale and the manufacture of distilled liquors because they are a poison, while permitting the free sale, subject only to ordinary taxes, of pure wines and pure malt liquors.

Mr. President, I love a toddy almost as well as Daniel Webster or Henry Clay ever did. I love one as well as George Washington or John Marshall ever did. I love a glass of wine as much as Shakespeare or Goethe ever did. But we must reason about everything with common sense. It never did me any



permanent good nor any material good of any inherently valuable sort, and never did anybody else any, except to make him feel a little bit better for a little while. There is nobody who will dispute that.

I take issue with men who think that because you like to have a drink yourself now and then, therefore you are a hypocrite if you do not want it sold to the public. Even if a man were dead certain that it never would hurt him—and speaking for myself I do not very well see how he could be dead certain of that—he might be dead certain that it never had, but I do not see how he could be dead certain that it never would, but if he were dead certain of both propositions he might still remember there were people in the world weaker than he. He might remember St. Paul's saying, "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." I would not be willing to go to the extent of pledging myself not to eat meat, but I would be willing to pledge myself not to try to help somebody to sell meat to the brother to whom it would do hurt.

I agree with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] about one thing. I do not like this idea of emphasizing the word "open" in connection with saloons. Let us not be hypocrites. Let us not be humbugs. If it is wrong to sell whisky, it is worse to sell it secretly than openly, and it is wrong to buy it, and if it is wrong to sell it and to buy it both, it is wrong, because it is hurtful to drink it. If I had my way, in so far as distilled liquors are concerned, being certainly not helpful to anybody in the long run nor for any great time in the short run even, except under very exceptional circumstances, I would forbid their sale and manufacture, but I would permit pure beer and pure wine to be sold as freely as bread. As Thomas Jefferson said years and years ago, "If you substitute them for whisky and for other distilled liquors you would have no drunkenness."

When I say pure beer, I mean the product of hops and malt with nothing else in it except pure water, and when I say pure wine I mean the fermented juice of the grape with nothing else in it except a little sugar to correct the overacidity of the grape, or something to correct an oversweet grape, since some southern grapes are too sweet otherwise to make wine. I would so define both in the statute. You might as well shoot peas at the rock of Gibraltar, however, as to bring into this great controversy a midway opinion like that. Both sides would agree only upon one thing, and that would be to carry me out and crucify me. And yet it was Christ's opinion that good wine might be made and given to one's fellows.

I merely mention my opinion, because it might be a curiosity to most of you to find somebody who stands midway between the two extremes.

Mr. President, I think now and then, however, that men in their desire to do good by law are dishonest. Some time ago one of the States of this Union—overnight you might say—passed a prohibition law forbidding the sale and manufacture of malt or vinous or distilled liquors within its boundary. Men in that State had hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in breweries and distilleries. Men in that State had just finished paying the State for their annual license, which was permission to sell for the next succeeding 12 months, and that State, which shall be nameless here, did not compensate the men for putting their distilleries and breweries on the junk pile; it did not even return to the men from whom they had collected the year's license the day before the law was passed the money which they had paid.

The highest form of morality can not afford to steal, and it ought not to steal; it ought not to take money under false pretenses. If it does not take it under false pretenses, if it takes it under a legitimate pretense, if by its own action it does away with the consideration for which the money was given, then it ought to restore it. In the mother country, at any rate, it has always been an axiom that compensation must be made to direct sufferers by a change of legislation.

Mr. President, I am willing to vote for this proposition outside of the fact that Mississippi wants me to vote for it, because I have come to the conclusion—and I have come to it after much standing upon the other side; I am one of the few men in Mississippi who ever did oppose prohibition who could be elected constable—but I have come to the conclusion that in some respects I was wrong about it, because it has done some good. It has not been a panacea; it has not brought about the millennium; it has not abolished drunkenness; it has not decreased crime to any marked extent; it has not, of course, kept lunatics out of the lunatic asylum; it has not done any sort of impossible thing that only extremists expected from it; but it has done a good deal of good; and I know that while liquor may do men of temperate temperaments some harm and does do

men of intemperate temperaments a great deal of harm, it never did me or anybody else in the long run any good worth contending for. It requires very little self-sacrifice to do without it. So I do not see how anybody can be hurt by doing his best to do without it, and I do see how some people can be helped.

I do not believe it is hurtful to me personally, as a rule; I think, upon the contrary, it is a very good thing for me now and then; but I do think that a man ought not to measure the world's corn in his half bushel; and when you look at it the world over, no frank human being, I do not care what his opinions are, can contend for one moment that the good that it does in the world is to be held in the slightest comparison with the evil which it does. I am perfectly willing to see the experiment tried, if it can be, and tried on me and all others. It never has been really and efficaciously tried on any nation of the white European race.

I know that perhaps this may be said upon the other side, and it may perhaps be true; I do not know why it is, but it happens to be true that almost in proportion as races upon this globe consume alcohol they stand near the head in culture, industry, and civilization, but I think it is a great deal for the same reason that the North American Indians were physically a great, strong people; it was because all of them that were not physically strong died before they reached the age of 21. So that when our Scotch brethren go up against their Scotch whisky for generation after generation and sip it at their breakfast and dinners, as we do wine, and yet when you find a Scotchman, anywhere from the Arctic Circle to the mouth of the Ganges, he is found at the head of whatever enterprise there happens to be where he happens to be; when your German has impressed himself upon the entire world, and your Dutchman, too, both consuming a great deal of alcohol; when your Frenchman, less intemperate than either, has not impressed himself quite so much; when your Spaniard, who is a very abstemious man, almost a totally abstemious man; and your Italian, who is very temperate, have not taken the stand that these others—Scotch, and English, and Irish, and North German—have taken; and when across in the prohibition country which Mohammed made totally prohibition by a decree of the Koran, they, too, have not stepped to the very front in civilization, notwithstanding the fact that they do not consume alcohol at all, I do not think it is because of the consumption of alcohol that one is high and the other is not so high; but I think it may possibly be due to the fact that if the natural law of evolution and development were left to work out the survival of the fit and the extinction of the unfit alcohol would help to work it, especially the extinction of the unfit. Alcohol does from generation to generation destroy the nervously and stomachically weak, and in that way has perhaps had something to do with placing these races, or, rather, the surviving individuals of them, at the place they are.

That, however, is a scientific sort of argument that is very un-Christian in its character and can not very well afford to be adopted as a basis for legislation by an enlightened legislative body in an enlightened country. All that argument, I say, I am acquainted with, because I have read it from scientists of every description. It is especially science after the German manner.

The same school of scientists, by the way, have contended that you ought not to be trying to save lunatics, because if you cure them they may go out and marry other lunatics, or even without it may be encouraged to multiply lunatics in the next generation or men and women with a tendency toward lunacy. They contend that you had just better let them die off like the brutes in the field.

Mr. President, I want to tell you, though, why I am in favor of referring this matter to the people of the District of Columbia. I want to give you a little illustration from my own recollection. The State of Tennessee adopted a prohibition law without submitting it to the people. The cities of Memphis, Knoxville, and Nashville did not want it. The consequence was that the city of Memphis deliberately elected a ticket to rule that city, every man of whom had to pledge himself beforehand not to enforce the law.

Memphis is my native town, and I used to go there very frequently, until my brother and I sold what property we had there. I went up there once after prohibition went into effect. Prior to that time the saloons were closed upon Sunday, at any rate, in Memphis. I happened to be there on a Sunday morning, owing to the delay between trains, when I was going to Pine Bluff, Ark. When I went out I saw something that I had never before seen in all my life—men upon the sidewalk on Sunday asking you to come in to buy a drink. Selling it upon Sunday was no greater crime than selling it upon any other day. The saloon doors were wide open; and these men were out



there just as you see people in front of certain little country town clothing stores calling people in and saying, "Do you not want to come in and buy some clothing?"

From that experience and from a great deal of other knowledge of that description, I have arrived at the conclusion that you can not enforce a law of this sort except in a community where a majority of the people themselves want the law, so as to impress upon the minority the fact that the law must be observed. Otherwise the majority is not going to respect the law, and you will not decrease drunkenness, but you will only increase lying and perjury and concealment and deadfalls and the bad habit of ignoring and defying law. It is otherwise where a majority, especially a large majority, want the law.

Take my own county in Mississippi, for example. In my county the prohibition law is almost perfectly enforced. At one time there were a few people in the chief town—not a very large town—of the county who wanted to defy the law, but after a little time, under the administration of officers elected to enforce the law, they stopped violating it. Mississippi has no very large cities.

Of course we have the power and we have the right, the legal right, to enact this amendment into law without any referendum to the people of the District of Columbia, who are to be affected by it. Senators ask, and ask very pertinently, why it is that law after law is passed here without any referendum, and yet when it comes to this question a referendum is sought. The answer is, because such a law as is now proposed depends peculiarly, if not altogether, for its efficacy and for its enforcement upon the public opinion of the people who are affected by it. That is the answer and that is sufficient. In other cases, especially in the case of criminal laws, directed against recognized crimes—crimes per se—the consensus of mankind is with you, public opinion is with you and itself stands behind the enforcement of the law; but if you have a majority of the people who think that you put a law upon them that they do not want, and which prohibits something in their opinion not in and of itself criminal, then they not only will not add their voice to its enforcement, but they will affirmatively use their influence in favor of its nonenforcement. So that I warn you now that if you want this law to be of any efficacy it must be after the people of the District of Columbia vote for it.

I am aware that there are some from my own section of the country who will say that that would bring the negro vote into it. That could be very easily cured. All you would have to do would be to provide that those who vote upon the question shall be those who can read and write, those who have never been convicted of a felony or of a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, and those who have paid the District of Columbia such taxes as have been assessed against them. In that way you will have a white majority and there will not be any race question involved.

Mr. President, I expected to say nothing, because I intended my vote to indicate my position, and there were reasons, to be perfectly frank about it, why I should say nothing. I had been an antiprohibitionist in my own State 20 years ago, and no politician or man in public life likes to be accused of inconsistency, no matter when or how he changes his opinion. That is one reason; and the next reason is, frankly, because I like a glass of wine myself now and then and I like a toddy now and then. I do not think the fact that I do has anything to do with what my vote should be upon this question, especially when I know that neither the one nor the other has ever done me any particular good, though neither has ever done me any particular harm or ever interfered with the performance of a private or a public duty.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this question involves a duty not only to our constituents in our respective States but a peculiar duty to our constituents in this District. I regret that this question must come before the Senate in this form. I have been taught by older Senators here that it is necessary to protect appropriation bills against amendments containing general legislation. I have tried time and time again to add such amendments to appropriation bills, and have had those amendments ruled out on points of order, and, I think, properly so. Every one of us must stand for the appropriation bills. The supply and appropriation bills are essential to the running of the Government, and if we permit general legislation to be tacked upon such bills we may be placed in a position where we must either neglect the Government or be compelled to vote for a measure which we oppose. If we pass a supply appropriation bill with general legislation upon it, we may incorporate in the bill a principle which is obnoxious to the Chief Magistrate of this country, as has been the case on former occasions, and compel his veto because of that objectionable principle. However, the Rules Committee, who are particularly charged with

the responsibility of looking after the rules of this body, if any such rules exist, have seen fit to recommend to Senators that they adopt this motion and suspend the rules of the Senate. I have great respect for that committee. They evidently consider that this proposition is of such vital importance that it warrants the setting aside of one of the most important rules of this body.

I am urged again to vote for the motion, because, so far as I have ascertained from my limited experience here, the only rules that are enforced in this body, or that exist, so far as I know, are rules to obstruct legislation rather than to facilitate it. I have occasionally, on asking the advice of some learned Senators who have been here a great many years, been referred to a rule which might enable me to secure the enactment of an item of legislation, but that rule had no sooner been discovered than there were twenty other rules called into existence which would cancel that rule.

I may vote against the proposed amendment, but I intend to vote for the pending motion because it appears to be the only means by which a fair test vote of the sentiment of this body can be obtained. I think the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD] is entitled to a vote on this question. I would prefer that the vote be had separately, but that seems impossible.

I voted that a majority, and not two-thirds, should determine the question of the suspension of the rules. The Senate has determined that it requires a two-thirds vote, but no matter what vote it requires, I think the Senator from Texas is entitled to have a vote on the main issue, and that is whether the proposed amendment shall become a part of the appropriation bill. It is a question which must be determined sooner or later by this body, and there is no use of dodging the issue. The issue will have to be met sooner or later on the question of whether or not we favor national prohibition. If I favored national prohibition, I would favor prohibition in the District, without consideration of the views or wishes of its residents.

I believe it the duty of a Senator, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has stated, to try to represent the wishes of his constituents where such action does not conflict with the Senator's moral obligation. I want to say that in my State this question has never been an issue; it has never even attracted the attention of the people of the State. I do not know what their views are on the subject. I know that in this body and throughout this country there are good people who differ as to the proper way to restrain and govern the liquor traffic. I do not know who is right; I have not given much study to the question; and I am not prepared to set up my opinion against either the opinion of the Senator from Missouri or the opinion of the Senator from Texas. I know, however, that I believe in local self-government throughout. I am sure that all of the people of my State believe in local self-government. I believe the question involved here is one which should be submitted to each State, to each county, and to each community. It is one of the peculiar questions affecting civic life which is always submitted to the community. It is a common and accepted practice to so submit it.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] said that we are the legislature of the District, the board of aldermen of the District, and that the legislature of a State has a right to pass a prohibition bill; but let me state the distinction. A legislature is elected by the people; a city council is elected by the vote of the people of the municipality, and their election depends upon the sentiment of the people of that community. We are the lawmakers for the District; we are its legislature and its city council, and yet they had nothing to do with our election. They have no way of impressing upon us their sentiments or their ideas. I believe, nevertheless, that they should be considered in such matters of legislation. I am not prepared to say that they should be allowed to vote, but I do say that they should have the right of every American citizen who is affected by legislation, and that is the right of petition, the right to express their opinions.

We can not say because the National Government is situated in the city of Washington that the National Government owns the city of Washington. Why, there are thousands of people that we have invited here, that we have brought here, that we have induced to buy property here, to live in this town; and is it possible that we shall say that they shall not even have the right to petition us as to what laws shall govern them; that they shall have no voice in this peculiar legislation; that they have no interest in the affairs or the legislation affecting them? It seems to me that would be intolerable. It seems to me that it is unjust and unreasonable; that it is an arbitrary use of power.



Following those principles of self-government, which I believe in throughout, I will vote to suspend the rules, and I will vote for any prohibition amendment to this bill which will go into effect after the same has been properly approved in the District.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914; and, on page 29, I read these words, among various other matters:

As the various States vote "dry" the operation of the bootlegger grows larger.

Then, on page 128, in an abstract of the seizures of illicit distilleries, I find that the State of Georgia heads the list with 867 seizures—a dry State.

As for my little reference to Georgia and to South Carolina, I hesitate somewhat, and would not say anything further except for the fact that the distinguished Senator from Georgia took me somewhat to task. I was a guest at Atlanta, Ga., that splendid, metropolitan, thriving city that kindled the very blood in me. I said that in Georgia the prohibition law was violated. I do not say what I heard, but, if Georgia has a prohibition law, then I say what I know—that in the city of Atlanta it is daily violated.

How? There is a cigar shop entrance with a swinging door. "What do you sell behind?" "Step in and see." Schlitz, or any other beer you want. "What is the difference between the Atlanta Schlitz," I asked, "and any other?" I never drink beer, but I was curious to know. I asked, "What is the difference between the Georgia Schlitz and the Schlitz of New York, New Jersey, or St. Louis, which prides herself upon it?" The man held up a bottle, and to all appearances to me it was the genuine Schlitz. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has the second time admonished the galleries to obey the rules of the Senate. Another violation will result in the clearing of the galleries.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Then, Mr. President, I did refer to South Carolina, that splendid valiant State I have heard about since I was a boy, and under the hospitable roof of many of those loyal, grand South Carolinians have I had the delights of life. I wandered through the delightful, historic city of Charleston. I had a desire to go out on the bay. I had heard of the beauties of the Battery, and all that. I walked out there and saw the glories of Charleston Bay. I walked on the Battery. I saw, far distant, Fort Sumter, Fort Moultrie, Castle Pickney, and all those places that I had heard so much about. I then wandered up that historic street, passing many of those beautiful homes, until I came to a superb-looking, typical, hospitable, southern hotel, with columns that would fairly rival those in front of our Treasury. It was delightful to contemplate. A swinging door bade me in. I walked in. I saw many delightful gentlemen and many superb ladies. Unfortunately, time would not permit me to tarry long. I was due back here in Washington to perform my duties. I went on a sad official mission. We had a party of several temperance Senators. I said to a gentleman at the threshold of the door: "Would it be possible to buy whisky here?" "No, sir; we are a prohibition State. The only way you can get it is at the dispensary." "What is the dispensary? Is it a medical institution?" "Oh, no," said he; "look right across yonder," and there I saw a 16-foot pine board marked "Dispensary No. 1."

I did not go in, but I stepped from the desk a little way, when a good Samaritan, a splendid type of a southerner, said, "My dear sir, do you see that beautiful palm garden there?" Ah, it brought me right back to the Pan American. "Yes," said I. Said he: "Just walk in there." I walked in there, and to the right was a door, being very much used, labeled "Commercial Club." I looked in, and, as God is my judge, there is no such sumptuously fitted, velvet-upholstered saloon in the city of Washington or elsewhere. [Laughter.] I went in there and they were doing a land-office business. Three bartenders were busy. I said: "How is this? I thought this was a prohibition State." He said: "It is a prohibition State. It is against the law to sell whisky. Nobody pretends to sell it, yet many do it." Said I: "How do you manage it?" "How do we manage it? We go on and sell, and once a month we are lugged up and we pay \$50. We pay \$600 a year for our license, and we have been doing that for years."

So that is my justification for drawing in Georgia, that superb, grand, empire State, and for bringing in glorious, historic South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey presents two statements to sustain his charge that prohibition in Georgia is a failure.

He refers to the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to show that there have been a number of arrests made

for illicit distilling in the State. Lest that statement should carry a false impression to Senators I wish to say that it is true that in the mountains of Georgia—and we have 20 counties almost entirely mountainous—there always has been a certain amount of illicit stilling carried on upon a very small scale. A mountain farmer will take a little still over near a spring and still a few bushels of corn. The actual output of the 800 persons who were arrested would not equal the amount of liquor that had been sold in the past by a single barroom of the more than 100 located in each of a number of the cities of the State. If all those barrooms have been suppressed by prohibition, it can not be claimed that because a few gallons of green corn whisky were made in the mountains prohibition is a failure.

But the Senator from New Jersey gives another reason why he says it has been a failure. He offers himself as a witness, and testifies that during his visit to Atlanta he found a place where, back of a door, not he but somebody else might have obtained a bottle of beer.

Why, if there is still a place in Atlanta where so royal a guest and so enterprising a citizen as the Senator from New Jersey might find a single stand in which to discover a bottle of "splits"—I do not know exactly what that means; I suppose it is some kind of beer—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. "Schlitz."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I accept the correction. I do not know whether it is "splits," in consequence of what it does, or "Schlitz," in consequence of its name. But if the Senator from New Jersey found one such place in the city of Atlanta, still I say that his charge that prohibition in the State is a failure is not sustained.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I took the general view that the State was Atlanta and that Atlanta was the State. I took the magnificent statesmen that emanated from there, and I knew the splendid hotels that have been built there.

The Senator says I took a bottle of Schlitz. No; I did not taste a bottle of Schlitz, for, as I said, I never drink beer; but I will say, Mr. President, with all the graciousness of my heart, that I would not belittle the magnificent hospitality of the Senator from Georgia nor the hospitality of that splendid State, with its splendid men and its glorious and lovely women. You did not try to tempt me with Schlitz, but you offered me something better. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator does not mean by that that I offered it to him; he means the city of Atlanta. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that when so distinguished a guest as the Senator from New Jersey reached our city of 200,000 inhabitants some citizen would offer him something with which to quench his thirst if the citizen thought the Senator from New Jersey desired it. But still, even if that be true, it is no argument to establish the claim that prohibition has been a failure. It has closed the barrooms; it has stopped the sale of liquor; it has stopped the jug trade out of the city of Atlanta and most of the other cities of Georgia. I am here to say, from watching its results carefully, that the year after it was put into effect it lessened the waste of physical energy, it increased the funds in the hands of those of limited means, it added to the receipts of the department stores and the stores that sold food, it bettered the condition of many a humble home in that city—and with that result I protest it is not a failure.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m., Friday, January 15, 1915) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, January 16, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1915.*

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Frederick L. Siddons to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

Herman Toering, Orange City.



## MASSACHUSETTS.

George P. Sheldon, Hopedale.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Blythe J. Davison, Canton.

Milton M. Dougherty, Mechanicsburg.

Helen G. Flanagan, Mill Hall.

Arthur McKean, Beaver Falls.

C. W. Sausser, Bellwood.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 15, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Keep us, O God our Father, in touch with Thee throughout the remaining hours of this day, that we enter not into temptation, but keep close to duty's call, that at its close we may lie down to sweet repose, cradled in the arms of Omnipotence and in the profound faith that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN, OF NEW JERSEY.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the order which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That Sunday, February 14, 1915, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. LEWIS J. MARTIN, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order which the Clerk has just read? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The order was agreed to.

RELATIONS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
(H. DOC. NO. 1488).

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a House document an article prepared by Mr. John A. Johnson, an attorney in the District of Columbia, on the relation of the District of Columbia to the Federal Government. It is a matter that is being very much discussed in the Congress, and in which we were all interested, and I think this article will throw some light on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to print as a public document an article prepared by Mr. Johnson on the relation of the District of Columbia to the Federal Government. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this express the opinion of Mr. Johnson or is it an historical record?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It is more an historical record than an opinion of anyone.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection if it is an historical record, but if it is simply the opinion of Mr. Johnson I would object to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. GREEN of Iowa, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

## IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls up the conference report and asks unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1270).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

6060) "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 26, 33, 58, 62, 74, and 95.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and in lieu thereof insert the following: "practice polygamy or believe in or advocate the practice of polygamy"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "treaties, conventions or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 3 and 4 of the matter inserted by the Senate strike out "and aliens returning after temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert a period after the word "guests," on page 11, line 21; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the amendment strike out "and" and insert "or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and in lieu thereof insert a period; and on page 13, line 18, strike out "for" and insert "For"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 14, line 18, after "commissions," insert "to an alien coming into the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 14, line 19, after "alien," insert "coming into the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate insert the following: "or otherwise"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "thereto," in the last line of the amendment, insert the following: "and the provisions of this section shall be excepted from that portion of section 38 of this act which provides that this act shall not be construed to repeal, alter, or amend section 6, chapter 453, third session Fifty-eighth Congress, approved February 6, 1905, or the act approved August 2, 1882, entitled 'An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea,' and amendments thereto"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After "officers," in line 3 of the amendment, insert: "at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor and under such regulations as he may prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After "inspectors," in line 3 of the amendment, insert: "at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor and under such regulations as he may prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "any alien who at the time of entry was a member of one or more of the classes excluded by law; any alien who shall have entered or who shall be found in the United States in violation of this act, or in violation of any other law of the United States, the methods and measure of proof and the destination of deportation to be those specified in the law violated"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof "or who enters without inspection"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by the master"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN L. BURNETT,  
AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

E. D. SMITH,  
JOE T. ROBINSON,  
H. C. LODGE,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement as follows:

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the House bill (H. R. 6060) regulating the immigration of aliens submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect agreed upon and recommended in the conference report.

The principal changes in existing law proposed by the Senate to which the managers on the part of the House agree are as follows:

First. The amendment which increases the head tax on adult aliens to \$6, coupled with the entire exemption from head tax of minor children accompanying a parent.

Second. So much of the Senate amendment No. 24 as strikes out the House provision prohibiting the exclusion of the wife or minor children of American citizens.

Third. The amendment which substitutes a new section 11 submitted by the Secretary of Labor to take the place of the House provision relative to surgical examinations on board ships engaged in the transportation of aliens.

Fourth. The amendment which denies to alien prostitutes the privilege of obtaining United States citizenship through marriage.

Fifth. The amendment which requires transportation companies carrying immigrants from Mexico or Canada to the United States to provide suitable landing places.

The principal amendments proposed by the Senate from which the managers on the part of the House recede are as follows:

First. The amendment excluding persons of the African race.

Second. The amendment striking the word "solely" from the House provision which extends exemption from the illiteracy test to refugees from religious persecution.

Third. So much of Senate amendment No. 24 as exempts certain Belgians from the illiteracy test and certain other provisions of the law.

The principal amendments proposed by the Senate to which the managers on the part of the House agree with amendments are as follows:

First. Senate amendment No. 11: The managers on the part of the House agree to so much of this amendment as strikes out of the polygamy clause the words objected to which require an alien to admit his belief in the practice of polygamy as a condition precedent to his exclusion on account of that belief. The managers on the part of the Senate agree to an amendment to Senate amendment No. 11, proposed by the House managers, the effect of which is as follows: A change in the words inserted by the Senate so as to exclude an alien who believes in the practice of polygamy, whether he admits it or not, in contradistinction to his exclusion on account of an abstract article in his creed.

Second. To the amendments of the Senate which provide a double inspection and a double medical examination for immigrants, the managers on the part of the House agree with

amendments giving the Secretary of Labor discretion in the matter. To these amendments the managers on the part of the Senate agree.

JOHN L. BURNETT,  
AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, there has been exhaustive debate on the controverted propositions in this bill so often that I presume the House is ready to vote upon the question. Therefore I move the adoption of the report, and on that I move the previous question.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion for the previous question for a couple of minutes?

Mr. BURNETT. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to point out to the House a couple of amendments which have been agreed to by the conferees, which shows the restrictive policy that actuates the conferees in submitting this bill. One of the amendments proposed by the Senate is amendment No. 7, which struck out the exemption of the payment of the head tax of \$6 by aliens who have in accordance with law declared their intention to become citizens of the United States on their return to this country from a sojourn abroad. I can not understand the policy of anyone doing that, unless he believes in the policy of America for Americans alone, of placing a head tax of \$6 on those future American citizens who have been domiciled here and who have already declared their intentions to become citizens of this country and who temporarily depart for a visit abroad. The Senate conferees struck out that exemption and the House conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment.

Further, as showing the restrictive character of those offering this bill, I direct the attention of the House to the Senate amendment No. 23, which reads as follows:

*Provided further, That aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens and aliens returning after temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile may be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, and under such conditions as he may prescribe.*

That amendment provides for the admission of aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, returning after temporary absence, in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. They have restricted that provision so that only those aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States can be admitted, who are admitted within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. It has been called to my attention that in the administration of the present immigration law aliens who have lived here as long as 10 years, and who have gone abroad for a brief span of three months, on their return to this country, without any objection as to their physical qualifications, have been absolutely forbidden to land, when they have lived here and intend to make this their home for all time. I can not see how anyone can declare that to be the proper American spirit which should prompt an American Congress in the treatment of those who have not relinquished their American domicile upon their return here after a temporary absence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. It will only take a moment. Upon what theory do the conferees leave out the right of a citizen to bring in his wife or minor children? That is amendment numbered 24.

Mr. BURNETT. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. It is in reference to amendment numbered 24. Upon what theory do the conferees leave out of the bill the provision which authorizes a citizen to have his wife or minor children brought into the country?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the gentleman, the Department of Labor makes this objection to that:

The present practice of the department is to regard wives as admissible. It is suggested that, in view of the very large number of mentally defective children encountered in administering the immigration law, the exception here proposed will have very far-reaching effects—will result in introducing into the country strains of mental deficiency, both extensive and serious.

In addition to the suggestion they make, the bill says "that nothing in this act shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States." Now, if those words were left there, an alien might come here and, after remaining for five years, file his declaration and bring in his son, an anarchist, 20 years 11 months and 29 days old. Many of the very worst of that class of people are the younger ones. Be-



sides, the prostitute daughters of an American citizen who had become naturalized, who had never come here, if that language were left there, could come in, and for that reason and for the reason suggested by the Department of Labor, that many of these people come here infected with the very worst kind of contagious diseases, and because they were children of an American citizen, would have to be admitted in violation of all these other wise provisions in the law.

Mr. MANN. One more question in the same connection. An American citizen, a person who comes here and takes out naturalization papers and becomes an American citizen, is it or not considered that his wife thereby becomes an American citizen and is entitled to entry regardless of the act?

Mr. BURNETT. The decisions of the courts are at variance in regard to that question. We have taken care of those who are afflicted further on by language which allows those who have declared their intention to become naturalized citizens to have those children come in and have hospital treatment, and I think, upon the whole, that the bill takes care of that class of citizens in every respect.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURNETT. I will.

Mr. BATHRICK. I desire to cite one case and ask how this bill will operate in that particular. Here is a citizen of the United States who has a minor child. This child has no relative or friends whatever except in the United States. Does the gentleman think this bill would operate to exclude that minor child and leave her upon the hands of strangers in the cold world in Europe when her parents were in the United States and were American citizens?

Mr. BURNETT. Not at all, Mr. Speaker. The law provides further on that these people can be brought in to be treated. These are matters that are left in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, in regard to the admission of even those under 16 years of age; and if they are children of these people, they can be admitted under the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, as the bill now provides.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. I would like to have an answer to the question from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. There is a distinction between the wife of a naturalized alien who married him prior to his naturalization and the wife of a naturalized alien who married him since his naturalization. If the wife married him prior to his naturalization and he comes out here and becomes naturalized, then it is a question whether he may send for his wife that he has left behind pending his naturalization and bring her in here notwithstanding that she may not be admissible under the immigration law. Court decisions vary, but the department regards such wives as admissible. Wives who marry naturalized citizens are, of course, admissible, and continue so under the proposed law unless they are of dissolute character. Now, if the gentleman would have it otherwise he would find himself faced by this situation: That a man might come here into the United States and after a residence of five years become naturalized and then send for his prostitute wife or prostitute minor daughter and bring them into the United States. I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio would not advocate anything like that.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that I have been a consistent and persistent advocate of this measure—

Mr. GARDNER. Absolutely.

Mr. BATHRICK. And a friend of this legislation.

Mr. GARDNER. I did not mean to put it that way. I endeavored to make clear to the House exactly the distinction between one who has attained citizenship by naturalization and one who has citizenship because born to it.

Mr. BATHRICK. I want to state one specific case a little more thoroughly. There is in the hospital at the port of New York at the present time a girl 11 years of age, the daughter of a citizen of the United States, who has been a citizen for over seven years and a very honorable citizen, too. That daughter was brought to this hospital and is being treated. She has no relative in Europe, she has no place to go, none to whom she can turn except her parents in the United States. I want to ask the gentleman if leaving out this clause, which I was glad to see in this bill, would preclude the admission of that daughter?

Mr. GARDNER. Provided she was born before her father's naturalization. She would not be admissible unless she were physically and morally qualified.

Mr. BATHRICK. Suppose she was born after her father's naturalization?

Mr. GARDNER. Assuming that she is physically qualified to come in.

Mr. BATHRICK. I am going to state another fact. I have investigated this case thoroughly respecting the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. One Secretary of Labor decided that that child being the offspring of a citizen of the United States was a citizen of the United States and entitled to entry if she was conceived in the United States.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, another Secretary of Labor decided that she would not be a citizen of the United States unless she was born in the United States. That illustrates the conflict of opinion and the difference of the exercise of the discretion of these Secretaries of Labor on these very important matters. Now, this was so drawn that these children who had no one to depend on except their citizen parents in the United States could come into this country, and I think they should come in, but, as it appears to be now, a parent who is loyal to the ideals of American citizenship will be prevented from bringing children into the United States.

Mr. GARDNER. Only if those children were born before naturalization. And if you have it otherwise, the Secretary of Labor tells us that it will result in introducing into the country strains of mental deficiency, both extensive and serious. I do not know about the gentleman's particular case. I should want to look into the evidence myself.

Mr. BATHRICK. I cite this case myself—

Mr. GARDNER. To quote the letter of the Secretary of Labor addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration February 21, 1914:

The circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court have held that the minor children of a naturalized citizen born prior to the parents' naturalization are aliens within the meaning of the immigration law. (U. S. ex rel. Di Rienzo v. Rodgers, 185 Fed., 334; Zartarian v. Billings, 204 U. S., 170.)

Clearly they ought to be aliens. Now, let us see what the practical situation is. If a man has become a naturalized citizen that means he has been five years in this country. If he is trying to bring in his children, it means that they have managed to get along without him, for five years at least, on the other side. There is no such hardship as the gentleman describes in making them continue to get along without him until such time as they are cured of all dangerous diseases.

Mr. BATHRICK. In this instance this child was cared for by her grandparents, and when they died she was thrown upon the world.

Mr. GARDNER. You have got to have those hardships if you want to keep away from this country aliens with mental deficiency strains. Like a great many other laws, the immigration statutes often are the occasion of great hardships, but they prevent even greater hardships. One resident of my district was obliged to pay his daughter's expenses in Liverpool for over a year trying to get her cured of trachoma. These cases are arising all the time. All these restrictions are put in to safeguard American children, and it is a matter of regret if sometimes they run counter to the merciful inclinations which we feel toward foreign children. Nevertheless these restrictions must be maintained.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman please inform the House the reason for striking out the words "and aliens returning after temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile"?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes. We allow those who have filed their first papers to come. But we believe it would not be right to allow those who come and perhaps go into some industry and build a little shack, and get a frying pan or two, and then want to go away and then come back, any such privileges of evading the provisions of the law. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] referred to that, and he thought it would be a hardship on the man who had stayed here for 5 or 10 years and had not declared his intention of becoming a citizen and who had then returned to Europe not to be permitted to come back. But, Mr. Speaker, as has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], we ought to be trying to take care of our own, and certainly that man who has been here for 5 or 10 years and has never declared his intention even, has never filed his first papers, which he could file the very



day he arrived here, ought not to have any more privileges than any ordinary alien.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even the man who has declared his intention to become a citizen, after his sojourn abroad, has no right to come in here. Under this provision it will be in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor to exclude him. The man who has expressed his intention to become a future citizen, and who goes abroad for a couple of months, when he comes back has no right to land here. The Secretary of Labor on his ipse dixit can say he has no right.

Mr. BURNETT. It leaves it with the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman also opposed such a liberal provision as exempting him from the literacy test when the bill was before the House.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I want the chairman of the committee, if possible, to explain why section 11 or amendment 50 was struck from the bill.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the question of the gentleman. I think that section 11 as the House passed it was a wise provision. It provided for matrons and surgeons on the ship bringing immigrants. It raised a perfect storm among the other nationalities. They said it would bring about confusion and division of authority on their own ships, and that we ought not to be permitted to put these people on their ships. Now we have provided for them, I think, by the addition at the end of that section of a provision to the effect that when those ships reach our port they may be detained until this very kind of an inspection and all other inspections can be made. That reaches the trouble, it seems to me, by allowing the inspection before the ships are ever permitted to land, and at the same time does not bring about that conflict of authority with other nationalities.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield me a minute?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BURNETT. For a question?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; for a question.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I notice there has been a change in amendment 17 in reference to treaties, conventions, and agreements.

Mr. BURNETT. No. 17—it was merely by inserting—

Mr. MOORE. The words "conventions or" seem to have been inserted.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; "treaties, conventions, or agreements"; and it was merely for the purpose of covering cases that "conventions" only could reach that that word was put in—"treaties, conventions, or agreements."

Mr. MOORE. That was to conform to the phraseology later on?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman explain, before he moves the previous question, whether the insertion of these treaty and convention paragraphs means that the treaties had with other nations—"treaties, conventions, and agreements"—with respect to passports are to be observed, so far as the rights of the foreign nations are concerned?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MOORE. That is to say, if any question like that of the Jewish question coming up from Russia should be raised, there would have to be a respect for the treaty or agreement had with that nation, and notice of abrogation would have to be given in the usual way?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; I suppose so.

Mr. MOORE. Would that apply to any agreement had with respect to the Chinese and Japanese?

Mr. BURNETT. I think "treaties, conventions, and agreements" would apply to what the gentleman understands is a gentlemen's agreement as to Japanese.

Mr. MOORE. Yes. There is a gentlemen's agreement there, though I understand there is a dispute as to its binding qualities.

Mr. GALLAGHER rose.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] one minute before I ask for a vote on the previous question, and will yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee, Judge GOLDFOGLE, and at the end of that time I shall move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I asked a question of the chairman of the committee with reference to section 11. Personally I am opposed to all legislation of this character,

because I believe it to be undemocratic and unfair. But if there was any one feature of this bill that ought to have received the most careful consideration it is that which provides for the medical inspection of these immigrants. The very fact that this section was stricken out shows the powerful influence exerted in the premises by the combined agencies of the shipping trust. That section was objected to by the shipping trust, and everybody knows that the shipping trust has been more directly responsible for the objectionable conditions prevailing in matters of immigration than any other particular influence. The greatest complaints at all of the different ports relate to the time allotted to medical inspection, which is woefully insufficient. And if there is any one thing that should be most carefully safeguarded it is the medical inspection of those people.

Poor but refined immigrants from Poland, Italy, and other parts of Europe, through the inefficient system of inspection that now obtains in the administration of the immigration laws of the country, have been subjected to great annoyance and irritation on their arrival here. All this could be effectively avoided if section 11 of this bill were permitted to become law. No better people, no more useful citizens can be found anywhere in these United States than the Italians and Poles who have cast their lot in the great city of Chicago and contributed so much that is good and meritorious to its civic virtue and industrial enterprise.

I can not fathom the animus back of legislation of this character when I realize what great good has been done to my city in particular and the country, as a whole, by the industry, frugality, and thrift of the sturdy sons of patriotic Poland and cultured Italy. Wherever industry requires the touchstone of labor, the brain, the brawn, and the genius of the Poles and Italians are there to enhance our wealth and conserve our progress. In view of these indisputable facts this legislation—unjustly discriminative in its logical effects—is a formidable menace to the welfare of our country and a distinct handicap to her financial, commercial, and industrial progress.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to prolong the discussion on this report or to discuss in detail—for that could not be done in the few minutes allotted to me—the points in difference between the two Houses; but I desire particularly to emphasize again the views so often expressed on this floor in opposition to the literacy test.

It has been well remarked that the test neither determined the fitness nor the character of the alien. It is a test that is un-American and undemocratic. It has been condemned in veto messages by two Presidents of the United States. An attempt was made in the last House to have the President's veto overruled, and that effort failed. Now it is again proposed that this literacy test be injected into the immigration bill.

The fact is that the conferees on the part of the House are not unanimous on this proposition. Two of the conferees, known to favor the literacy test, have, it is true, agreed with the Senate conferees. One of the conferees on the part of the House, who has always been a very earnest and consistent opponent of the literacy test, of course has disagreed with the conferees. The entire metropolitan press of New York and, generally speaking, the press of the larger cities, have condemned the literacy test. These cities from which this condemnation so largely comes abound with immigrants and those who have been of the immigrant classes and who have come from every part of the habitable world. The people of these cities have not been apprehensive of the imaginary dangers that have been mooted and have not shared the fears that the advocates of the measure have expressed on the floor of this House about the influx of immigration. They have rather found that immigration has been in many ways helpful to the land and served to promote the general upbuilding and welfare and contributed to the prosperity of our country.

The hand of toil is still required to further develop the resources of our land. I do not wish to repeat, but desire only in a word to refer to what I so often said during debates here on the immigration question, that the American boy is fast leaving the farm and is allured to the cities, and there is consequent necessity, especially in these times when crops are getting less and cost of living is ever on the increase, to bring to the agricultural districts those who are willing to work on the farm and till and cultivate the soil. We still require those who must help to dig the mines, tunnel the mountains, lay tracks, build railroads, and do the hundred and one things that enter into manual labor. If the immigrant coming from abroad, hopefully looking forward to making his way decently upward and onward in our communities and to assimilate with us in our American life, is healthy in mind and body, is law-abiding, is free from those



objections which under existing law would make him excludable, what reason, except for arbitrary restriction, can be offered to his admission to this country, where he can, through the multitude of our agencies which go to the Americanization of the foreigner and through the manifold educational opportunities we afford almost everywhere, though he come here illiterate, in time qualify himself for worthy citizenship, as have the thousands and thousands of others in the past whose situation has been similar.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is useless here to continue the discussion. I realize that argument which will demonstrate by facts and figures the absurdity and injustice of the literacy test will at this time be unavailing. The vote of the House heretofore taken on the Burnett bill foreshadows the result to be expected on the present motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] to concur in the conference report. But I would not let this opportunity to voice my objections pass, even in the few minutes now yielded to me, without in the line of the course I have heretofore steadily pursued to again emphasize my views and enter my protest against this unfair literacy test. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on agreeing to—

Mr. BURNETT. One moment, Mr. Speaker. I withhold my motion for just one minute, in which to read the statement of the Secretary of Labor.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] stated that the Shipping Trusts are the ones that were interested in striking out section 11. The Secretary of Labor states:

I am inclined to believe that, as the plan there contemplated would be somewhat in the nature of an experiment, it might be well to defer consideration thereof, at least for the present. I am led to this opinion by reason of the fact that if it should be advisable (later) to resort to it, it will possibly be better to inaugurate it by cooperation, for which purposes authority exists in the exercise of the general powers of this department.

Mr. DUPRE. Will the gentleman state what he is reading from?

Mr. BURNETT. The report of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask when that report was made?

Mr. GARDNER. That was in 1914.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GALLIVAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] both demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. I was not in at the time the report was made, and I should like to know whether a vote for the conference report will also include a vote for the literacy-test provision?

The SPEAKER. It includes everything that is in the conference report. The Chair does not know what is in it. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 46 Members seconding the demand and 69 rising in opposition.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 94, not voting 103, as follows:

## YEAS—227.

Abercrombie	Byrnes, S. C.	Doolittle	Hamilton, Mich.
Adair	Byrnes, Tenn.	Doughton	Hamilton, N. Y.
Adamson	Callaway	Edwards	Hamlin
Aiken	Campbell	Evans	Harris
Alexander	Candler, Miss.	Farr	Harrison
Anderson	Cantrill	Ferris	Hart
Anthony	Caraway	Fess	Haugen
Ashbrook	Carlin	Fields	Hawley
Aswell	Carter	Finley	Hay
Austin	Church	Floyd, Ark.	Hayden
Baltz	Clark, Fla.	Foster	Hayes
Barkley	Claypool	Fowler	Heflin
Bathrick	Cline	Francis	Helgesen
Beakes	Collier	Frear	Helm
Beall, Tex.	Connelly, Kans.	French	Helvering
Bell, Cal.	Cox	Gardner	Henry
Blackmon	Crisp	Garrett, Tenn.	Hensley
Borchers	Cullop	Garrett, Tex.	Hill
Bowdle	Curry	Gillett	Hinds
Brockson	Danforth	Glass	Holland
Brown, W. Va.	Decker	Godwin, N. C.	Houston
Browning	Dent	Goeke	Howard
Bryan	Dershem	Good	Hughes, Ga.
Buchanan, Ill.	Dickinson	Goodwin, Ark.	Hughes, W. Va.
Burke, S. Dak.	Dies	Gray	Hull
Burnett	Dillon	Greene, Vt.	Humphrey, Wash.
Butler	Dixon	Gregg	Humphreys, Miss.

Jacoway	McLaughlin	Reed	Switzer
Johnson, Ky.	MacDonald	Rouse	Talbot, Md.
Johnson, S. C.	Maguire, Nebr.	Rubey	Tavener
Johnson, Wash.	Mapes	Rucker	Taylor, Ala.
Jones	Martin	Rupley	Taylor, Ark.
Kelly, Mich.	Montague	Russell	Taylor, Colo.
Kelly, Pa.	Moon	Saunders	Temple
Kent	Morgan, Okla.	Seldomridge	Thomas
Kettner	Moss, Ind.	Sells	Thompson, Okla.
Key, Ohio	Mott	Shackelford	Thomson, Ill.
Kiess, Pa.	Murray	Shreve	Tribbie
Kindel	Neeley, Kans.	Sims	Underhill
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Neely, W. Va.	Sinnott	Underwood
Kirkpatrick	Nolan, J. I.	Sisson	Vaughan
Kitchin	Padgett	Slayden	Vinson
Knowland, J. R.	Page, N. C.	Slomp	Volstead
Lafferty	Palmer	Small	Walker
La Follette	Park	Smith, Idaho	Walters
Langham	Parker, N. Y.	Smith, J. M. C.	Watkins
Lee, Ga.	Patton, Pa.	Smith, Saml. W.	Watson
Lenroot	Platt	Smith, Tex.	Weaver
Leshner	Porter	Sparkman	Webb
Lever	Pou	Stedman	Whaley
Lewis, Md.	Price	Stephens, Cal.	White
Lindbergh	Quin	Stephens, Miss.	Williams
Linthicum	Ragsdale	Stephens, Nebr.	Wingo
Lloyd	Rainey	Stephens, Tex.	Witherspoon
McGuire, Okla.	Raker	Stout	Young, N. Dak.
McKellar	Rauch	Summers	Young, Tex.
McKenzie	Rayburn	Sutherland	

## NAYS—94.

Bailey	Donohoe	Keating	Phelan
Barnhart	Donovan	Kennedy, Conn.	Reilly, Conn.
Bartholdt	Driscoll	Konop	Reilly, Wis.
Bartlett	Drukker	Korbly	Roberts, Mass.
Borland	Dupré	Lazaro	Rogers
Britten	Eagan	Lee, Pa.	Sherley
Brown, N. Y.	Esch	Levy	Sherwood
Browne, Wis.	Fergusson	Lieb	Sloan
Buchanan, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lobeck	Smith, N. Y.
Bulkley	Fordney	Logue	Stafford
Burgess	Gallagher	Lobergan	Steenerson
Burke, Wis.	Gallivan	McAndrews	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Garner	McGillicuddy	Stone
Cantor	Gerry	Madden	Talcott, N. Y.
Cary	Gill	Mahan	Thacher
Casey	Gilmore	Mann	Towner
Clancy	Gittins	Miller	Treadway
Coady	Goldfogle	Mitchell	Tuttle
Corry	Gorman	Moore	Vollmer
Cooper	Goulden	Morgan, La.	Wallin
Copley	Graham, Ill.	Mulkey	Whitacre
Cramton	Greene, Mass.	Norton	Woods
Crosser	Hardy	Parker, N. J.	
Deitrick	Johnson, Utah	Peterson	

## NOT VOTING—103.

Ainey	Elder	Kennedy, R. I.	Plumley
Allen	Estopinal	Kinkaid, N. J.	Post
Avis	Fairchild	Kreider	Powers
Baker	Falson	Langley	Prouty
Barchfeld	Falconer	L'Engle	Riordan
Barton	FitzHenry	Lewis, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Lindquist	Rothermel
Boober	Gard	Loft	Sabath
Brodbeck	George	McClellan	Scott
Broussard	Gordon	Maher	Scully
Bruckner	Graham, Pa.	Manahan	Smith, Md.
Brumbaugh	Green, Iowa	Metz	Smith, Minn.
Burke, Pa.	Griest	Mondell	Stanley
Carew	Griffin	Morin	Stevens, N. H.
Carr	Gudger	Morrison	Stringer
Chandler, N. Y.	Guernsey	Moss, W. Va.	Taggart
Connolly, Iowa	Hamill	Murdock	Taylor, N. Y.
Dale	Hinebaugh	Nelson	Ten Eyck
Davenport	Hobson	O'Brien	Townsend
Davis	Howell	Oglesby	Vare
Difenderfer	Hoxworth	O'Hair	Walsh
Dooling	Hulings	Oldfield	Wilson, Fla.
Doremus	Igoe	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, N. Y.
Dunn	Kahn	Paige, Mass.	Winslow
Eagle	Keister	Patten, N. Y.	Woodruff
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LANGLEY (for) with Mr. SABATH (against).

Mr. KEISTER (for) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. DUNN (for) with Mr. GORDON (against).

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia (for) with Mr. MORIN (against).

Mr. GUERNSEY (for) with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts (against).

Mr. GRIEST (for) with Mr. LOFT (against).

Mr. BELL of Georgia (for) with Mr. SCULLY (against).

Mr. BARTON (for) with Mr. METZ (against).

Mr. POWERS (for) with Mr. PATTEN of New York (against).

Mr. FAISON (for) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (against).

Mr. AVIS (for) with Mr. EDMONDS (against).

Mr. WILSON of Florida (for) with Mr. RIORDAN (against).

Mr. MONDELL (for) with Mr. HOWELL (against).

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia (for) with Mr. FAIRCHILD (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada with Mr. ESTOPINAL.

Mr. DALE with Mr. AINEY.



Mr. CARR with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. BOOHER with Mr. DAVIS.  
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. FALCONER.  
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. HINEBAUGH.  
 Mr. EAGLE with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. KAHN.  
 Mr. GARD with Mr. HULINGS.  
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.  
 Mr. IGOE with Mr. KREIDER.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. NELSON.  
 Mr. MORRISON with Mr. MANAHAN.  
 Mr. TAGGART with Mr. SCOTT.  
 Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. PETERS.  
 Mr. TAYLOR of New York with Mr. VARE.  
 Mr. STANLEY with Mr. WOODRUFF.  
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.  
 On motion of Mr. BURNETT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Magazine of the Evening Star there is an article by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, relating to the military preparedness in this country, a very valuable and interesting article by reason of the information it contains, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to print in the Record an article by his colleague [Mr. HAY] relating to the military preparedness of the United States. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to couple with that a request that an article by myself be printed in the Record.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that anybody would object to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but is it not too late?

The SPEAKER. If the rule was strictly construed, yes; but if all the rules of the House were strictly construed, we would have a riot here in a week. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to object to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an article by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] requests unanimous consent to print an article on the same subject by himself in the Record.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let us have those two requests put separately.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remark in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print 10,000 copies of the immigration bill, with the law as it now stands and the law as it will be as amended, in parallel columns. There is a great demand for it and they are soon exhausted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to have printed 10,000 copies of the immigration bill just passed and the old law, printed in parallel columns. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Alabama know how much it will cost?

Mr. BURNETT. No; I have no idea.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman had better first find out. I do not think anyone will object.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a speech made recently by the gentleman from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER, on the ship-purchase bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech by Judge ALEXANDER on the ship-purchase bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I think you ought to have also a speech made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] on the other side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a letter from former Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, on the warehouse system in that State and in regard to the cotton situation in the South.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a letter from ex-Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, on the warehouse system and the cotton situation in the South. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Are all of these extensions of remarks to go in at the end of the Record and not in the proceedings of to-day?

The SPEAKER. They should all go in at the end of the Record.

Mr. GARNER. I think the Speaker should give instructions to that effect, so that the Record will not be made so cumbersome.

The SPEAKER. In the first place, the Speaker has no control over that matter, but he has requested the Public Printer two or three times to print these extensions of remarks at the end of the Record.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an address made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] on the same question which was discussed by the gentleman from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER—the ship-purchase bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech made by the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SAUNDERS, on the other side of the ship-purchase bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have read at the desk certain resolutions by the Legislature of the State of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to have read at the Clerk's desk certain resolutions passed by the Michigan Legislature. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I do not think we ought to begin that practice. The gentleman can ask leave to extend his remarks and print them in the Record.

Mr. CRAMTON. The subject matter of these resolutions, I think, is one in which the people of Michigan are especially interested, affecting the State in a peculiar way. The resolutions present certain facts which I believe should have the consideration of this House. The gentlemen on the other side have expressed a desire that all these matters go under extension of remarks at the back of the Record, where no one will ever see them. I do not like to have these resolutions printed in that way, for I want them read here in the House.

Mr. MANN. In the course of the year the legislatures of the various States probably pass a thousand resolutions telling Congress what it should do, which is not within the province of the legislature, and I am opposed to the practice of wasting time reading the resolutions, and I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, looking at the Record of yesterday, page 1585, I find some comment there upon the bill H. R. 11178, the apple-box bill, and certain proceedings taken by me or in which I am alleged to have participated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to get the permission of the House.

Mr. RAKER. I want to make the statement and then ask permission.

Mr. MANN. I said yesterday that the gentleman from California would need an hour; why not give it to him?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] having one minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask time later to be heard on this matter, but I want to say now, in justice to myself, that I was absent from the House yesterday on account of sickness in our family, in which I was compelled to send my wife home.

As to the suggestion as to why the bill H. R. 11178 was not taken up, I will take up that matter later. I want to say that



the bill will eventually receive proper consideration and will be considered by the House this session.

Mr. MANN. I notice that the gentleman from Ohio changed his remarks yesterday in order to take care of the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], delivered at the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] upon the subject of rivers and harbors. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The message also announced that the President had, on January 11, 1915, approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 2824. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891;

S. 2651. An act providing for the purchase and disposal of certain lands containing the minerals kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, china clay, and ball clay in Tripp County, formerly a part of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota;

S. 6106. An act validating locations of deposits of phosphate rock heretofore made in good faith under the placer-mining laws of the United States;

S. 7107. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Metropolis, Ill.;

S. 6454. An act to authorize the Government Exhibit Board for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to install any part or parts of the Government exhibit at the said exposition in the exhibit palaces of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. or in the Government building at said exposition; and

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to present the bell of the late United States steamship *Princeton* to the borough of Princeton, N. J.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20189, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill, with Mr. RAINEY in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the pending amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 24, insert the following:

"Harbor at Bridgeport, Conn.: For completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 898, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$111,300.

"Unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for improvement of the harbor at Bridgeport, Conn., is hereby made available for continuing improvement of said harbor in accordance with the report submitted in said House Document No. 898, Sixty-third Congress, second session."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the demand of the gentleman from Connecticut for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. SPARKMAN to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 56, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Thames River, Conn.: For maintenance, \$14,500.

Mr. MAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 5, on page 5, add the following:

"For improving the harbor at New London, Conn., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 613, Sixty-third Con-

gress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$170,000."

Mr. MAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment to the bill which I have just offered is taken verbatim from the rivers and harbors bill which passed this House during the last session of Congress.

Nearly four years ago the Legislature of the State of Connecticut passed a bill concerning steamship terminals at New London. That measure appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 and authorized the commissioners of rivers and harbors of that State to use the same in the construction of a dock or pier for the purpose of expediting the interchange of railroad and water traffic. The commissioners were given power, on behalf of the State, to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, land necessary for the construction of said pier; in section 5 of this act authority is given the rivers and harbors commissioners of Connecticut "to enter into agreements with authorized representatives of the Federal Government relative to sharing in or apportionment" between said Federal Government and the State of Connecticut of the cost of constructing said canals, basins, channels, or other facilities hereby authorized.

This act was approved July 25, 1911.

On December 14, 1911, the Hon. Edwin W. Higgins, a Member of this House from Connecticut, introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make a survey of New London Harbor, Conn., and its approaches.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause examinations and surveys to provide a uniform depth in the harbor at New London, Conn., of 45 feet, and make such surveys, examinations, investigations, and reports as will insure the full cooperation of the United States with the State of Connecticut in the improvement of the New London (Conn.) Harbor and its approaches.

This bill became a law, and, in pursuance thereof, the matter of improving the harbor of New London was referred to Maj. G. B. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and I read from his report:

From: The district engineer officer.

To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army (through the division engineer).

Subject: Report of survey of New London Harbor, Conn.

First. In compliance with the provisions of the rivers and harbors act of July 25, 1912, and with departmental letter of December 12, 1912, I submit the following report on the survey of New London Harbor, Conn., with a view to securing increased depth of channel and for report upon the question of cooperation on the part of the State of Connecticut in the improvement of said harbor and its approaches.

Second. The survey was made during the past summer. It embraced a complete hydrographic survey of the harbor and a topographical survey of the shores. The nature of the bottom, along the line of the proposed channel, was investigated by forcing down by hand a suitably supported pipe. A map of the harbor, in three sheets, is submitted with this report.

Third. The improvement of New London Harbor now desired is an entrance channel of size sufficient to accommodate ocean-going steamships; the natural depth available, 26 feet at mean low water, not being sufficient for vessels of that class. The harbor is, in many respects, admirably adapted to development as an ocean port. It is approached by deep water over a route that does not offer any grave dangers to navigation; its waters are sheltered, and it is rarely, if ever, closed by ice. The small tidal range is advantageous from the standpoint of terminal construction and operation. The harbor bottom is of soft material and the cost of securing an entrance channel of sufficient dimensions for the present purposes and of enlarging it to meet future needs will be very small in comparison with that necessary for the development of other harbors of the United States. The railroad connections with tributary territory are ample. Its disadvantages lie in its limited area of natural deep water and in the topography of its shores. While the hills bordering the harbor are of no great elevation, the amount of lowlands easily and cheaply adaptable for commercial and manufacturing enterprises is somewhat limited.

Fourth. The present commerce of the harbor is practically entirely coastwise. It amounted to 907,990 short tons, valued at \$107,688,345.90, during the calendar year 1912. The proposed improvement will not appreciably benefit the greater part of this commerce, as the existing depths are ample for vessels engaged therein. A small portion of the amount, amounting to certainly not over 15 per cent, but probably less, is received in New York Harbor from over-sea ports and thence shipped to New London for consumption and railroad distribution. It is possible that this portion might be shipped direct to New London were the harbor an ocean port.

Fifth. The commerce to be benefited by the proposed improvement is, except for the small amount just mentioned, entirely prospective. Its volume will depend upon a number of factors, among which the activity of the mercantile interests who may identify themselves with the port is, perhaps, the most important. The attached letter from the rivers, harbors, and bridges commission of the State sets forth the view of those interested in the commercial possibilities of the harbor.

Sixth. In anticipation of such commerce the State of Connecticut has purchased lands, prepared the designs, and is about to enter into the first contract for the construction of a pier and terminal in the harbor at the location shown on the accompanying map. The pier is to be of most modern construction, is to be 1,000 feet long, and the slips alongside will be excavated to 35 feet at mean low water. It is to be provided with cargo-handling facilities, and there are to be constructed in conjunction therewith terminal railroad yards and warehouses. The appropriation made by the State for the purpose is \$1,000,000, and it appears likely that the actual cost will approach that figure. The expenditure of this large sum by the State for this purpose was not without opposition, and during the past session of the legis-



lature a somewhat vigorously supported, but unsuccessful, proposal was made to withdraw the appropriation.

Tenth. The cooperation proposed by the State of Connecticut in the improvement of the harbor and its approaches, as set forth in the attached letter, to which reference has previously been made, consists in the construction of the pier and terminal and in the dredging necessary to connect this pier with the channel. It appears that the State authorities have never contemplated any contribution toward the cost of improving the main channel of the harbor as a part of this cooperation.

Eleventh. While the commerce which is expected to follow the proposed improvement can not be forecast with certainty, yet it is highly improbable that such a large and well-appointed terminal as that which the State proposed to provide will go unused, and a considerable commerce may be expected to follow the improvement. In view of the natural advantages of the harbor and the relatively small cost of improvement, I am of the opinion that New London Harbor is worthy of improvement by the General Government to the extent of providing a channel 33 feet deep at mean low water from the natural deep water in the upper harbor to Long Island Sound, at a cost of \$330,000 for original construction and an amount estimated at \$2,000 per annum for maintenance. The work should be prosecuted at such a rate as to secure its completion in two years. If the project is adopted by Congress, the amount of \$170,000 should be provided as an initial appropriation and a continuing contract authorized to include the remaining amount of \$160,000.

Twelfth. In compliance with the provisions of the act, I further report that the cooperation by the State of Connecticut in the improvement of New London Harbor and its approaches should consist in the construction of a pier and terminal, of the character proposed by the rivers, harbors, and bridges commission of the State, and in the excavation of the channel to connect this pier with the main channel, and I recommend that the entering into contracts covering the essential portions of this work by the proper agencies of the State of Connecticut should be a condition precedent to the expenditure of the funds that may be appropriated by Congress for the excavation of the main channel.

G. B. PILLSBURY,  
Major, Corps of Engineers.

This report, known as Document No. 613, was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; was favorably reported by that committee, as follows:

Improving harbor at New London, Conn., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 613, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$170,000.

Now, I submit, we have here an implied obligation between the State of Connecticut and the United States Government, in which the State of Connecticut invites cooperation with the United States Government with a view to improving the channel and the harbor of New London. We have the bill introduced by the Hon. Mr. Higgins, which became a law; we have a favorable report by the Army Engineers, representatives of the United States Government; and a favorable report from last year's Rivers and Harbors Committee and favorable action by this House during the last session accepting the report; and the favorable report to the Senate of the United States by the Senate Committee on Commerce, and failed to pass the Senate only by reason of the substitution of an amendment striking out all of the items contained in the original bill and appropriating the sum of \$20,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the State of Connecticut has done its part and has fulfilled each and every one of its obligations. It has met with the conditions prescribed in the Army Engineer's report.

After this act passed this House the contract was let by the rivers, harbors, and bridges commissioners of Connecticut for the excavation of a channel from the pier to the proposed main channel, and to-day the State is obligated in more than three-quarters of a million dollars.

As the case now stands, the State of Connecticut, relying upon the favorable report of the Army engineers, the approval of the Secretary of War, the favorable report of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House, and the favorable action by this House during the last session, has gone forward in good faith and expended more than three-quarters of a million dollars in the purchase of real estate, awarding contracts for the construction of the new pier, and the excavation of the new channel, and by the middle of the coming summer the State of Connecticut will have expended in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000.

This is not only for the benefit of the State of Connecticut, but for the direct benefit of the United States, for the reason that 2 miles above the end of this proposed new channel the United States Government owns nearly 1,000 acres of land, with a mile of water front, which was presented by the State of Connecticut and accepted by the Government for use as a naval station, with ample depth of water to float the largest ships of our Navy. The Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in improving its property, erecting thereon many substantial buildings, a large wharf, and a coal-station for the ships of war. The deepening of this channel will enable the largest ships of our Navy to sail up the harbor of New London to the naval station, where, should

trouble ever come, our ships of war could retire for repairs and coaling.

The harbor of New London, which has a fine, clear entrance from the ocean, is accessible at all times and all seasons, and from it vessels can proceed to sea and be clear of land within a few hours. The entrance to New London Harbor, across Long Island Sound, is protected on both sides of the channel by fortifications of such strength that it might justly be called the Gibraltar of America. These fortifications guard the opening of the eastern end of Long Island Sound, the importance of which may be seen from the fact that it is one of the two approaches to the city and harbor of New York and Brooklyn, as well as protection to many large cities in Connecticut on the shores of Long Island Sound.

More than 50 years ago the harbor of New London was recommended for the site of a great naval station by a committee appointed by Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles, under authority of a joint resolution adopted by Congress August 12, 1862, as possessing greater advantages for a naval station than any other site mentioned in the resolution.

In view of all these facts, Mr. Chairman, I submit that it would be but the part of wisdom for this Government at this time to make this appropriation, which would enable us to make use of these natural advantages for a harbor of refuge and the possible use as a naval station as a site for the construction and repair of naval ships and the manufacture of munitions of war.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the length of the river from the Sound in?

Mr. MAHAN. Our river is navigable from New London for 14 miles. The harbor for which this appropriation is sought is known as the harbor of New London and is 3 miles long and a mile wide, and it is known and always has been known as one of the finest natural harbors on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. GOULDEN. I believe the gentleman claims that this is not a new project, but has been appropriated for in a previous bill?

Mr. MAHAN. Last Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the present depth of water?

Mr. MAHAN. The harbor has an average depth of 24 feet.

Mr. MADDEN. And the proposed depth is 33 feet?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes; and for this reason—

Mr. MADDEN. Just one moment. How much of the million dollars has the State of Connecticut expended?

Mr. MAHAN. The State of Connecticut has already contracted for more than three-quarters of a million, and before this year is over the contract will be completed at the expense of practically \$1,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. And you are only asking in this bill what was, as a matter of fact, appropriated last year?

Mr. MAHAN. That is all, \$170,000, which was appropriated by this committee last year, which passed this House and went to the Senate and received a favorable report from the Senate committee.

Mr. LOGUE. Are we to understand that the State of Connecticut either has expended, or is expending, a million dollars for which this appropriation is necessary to cooperate?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes; more than that. The report of the engineers made it a condition precedent that before Congress appropriated any money the State of Connecticut should go forward and award the contracts.

Mr. LOGUE. And the State of Connecticut has started to do her share?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes. The State has purchased over \$100,000 worth of land and let the contract for a pier that will cost between six and seven hundred thousand dollars, and the lower structure alone will cost more than half a million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be permitted to proceed until he finishes his remarks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should have to object to that.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it five minutes.

Mr. MAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up much of the time of this House since I have been here, and I hope you will give me sufficient time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONERGAN. With the permission of the Chair and the House, I desire to modify my request and ask to make it 10 minutes.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut that his colleague be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX. How does the State of Connecticut get the money, by private contribution or taxes?

Mr. MAHAN. The State of Connecticut makes appropriations, and it has borrowed the money.

Mr. COX. Sold bonds?

Mr. MAHAN. Sold bonds, and is paying nearly 4 per cent interest on the money.

Mr. COX. State bonds?

Mr. MAHAN. State bonds. The State will practically have no return on its investment for the next three years. Contracts were awarded because of the express condition contained in the report of the engineers, making it a condition precedent that the State should first award contracts for pier before favorable action of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the tonnage at New London?

Mr. MAHAN. Nearly a million of tons a year. The commerce now is local, but what we are bidding for is foreign commerce. The present value of the tonnage is nearly \$125,000,000 annually.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHAN. I will.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Were the contracts approved by the Board of Army Engineers prior to the appropriation of this money by the State of Connecticut?

Mr. MAHAN. Oh, yes, sir; not until the report of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was the contract awarded to dredge the channel, and the dredging of the channel was conditioned on the report of the engineers, which made it our duty to do so. The report of the engineers found that the cooperation between the State of Connecticut and the United States should consist in the State of Connecticut building a pier and excavating a channel from the pier to the proposed new channel.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Then we are to understand that prior to the appropriation of this money by the State of Connecticut this project was approved by the Board of Army Engineers?

Mr. MAHAN. It was approved by the Board of Army Engineers.

Mr. MOORE. Was it not actually reported in the last river and harbor bill?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes; it was.

Mr. MOORE. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors approved it?

Mr. MAHAN. And it passed this House without opposition.

Mr. MOORE. Now, will the gentleman indicate what kind of commerce enters the port of New London; it is a large coal port, is it not?

Mr. MAHAN. It is, and at New London the commerce—

Mr. MOORE. It is at the upper end of Long Island?

Mr. MAHAN. It is at the upper end of Long Island. It has a large and diversified commerce. We are shipping hundreds of thousands of tons of sugar that come into the harbor of New London from the harbor of New York, sugar coming in large ships to New York and there placed upon a lighter and put upon the boats owned by the Central Vermont Railroad and the Grand Trunk and taken to New London, where it is re-shipped to Chicago and points North and West.

Mr. MOORE. Is any railroad interested in this improvement?

Mr. MAHAN. No. On the contrary, to show the attitude of the railroads, we asked the two railways to have the engineers of the respective railways meet with the commissioners of Connecticut at New London and help them select the best site for the location for this pier, so that the railroads might connect their tracks with the tracks on the proposed new pier, and the reply of one corporation was that there was no land in New London suitable for connecting the two railroads. It is a State-owned pier, which will be operated by the State, and not a dollar or penny will any railroad anywhere have an interest in it. We have provided at large expense that this will be connected with the tracks of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad and the Grand Trunk Railroad. That is absolutely necessary to make this project a success, as we believe it will be.

Mr. MOORE. Has the Grand Trunk come in yet?

Mr. MAHAN. It is there. It owns a pier not far away from New London. I want to say in connection with this—and it is one of the evils and curse of most cities along our coast—that the city of New London lies on the west bank of the Thames River. From where the river narrows, at Winthrop Point be-

low the fort nearly three-quarters of a mile, is the business portion of the town, and a greater part of that land is owned by the Central Vermont Railroad and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, and they have got docks lying idle and rotting down that they have no use for, which they will not use themselves and will not permit anyone else to use. Now, as to the economy part of it. New London has always been a dividend payer and breadwinner for this Government.

From the beginning of the Government until 1871 no record was made of the amounts collected at each customhouse, but I have here the report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce as to the customs collected in Connecticut. I will not take time, gentlemen, to read it, but I want to call your attention to the fact that the first 10 years since 1871 the amount of money collected in the customhouse at the port of New London averaged over \$60,000 a year; and the State of Connecticut is paying into the United States Treasury from moneys collected at the ports of Connecticut \$1,000,000 a year. I want to say further that during all this time, since the organization of this Government, there has been but \$157,000 expended for maintenance of this harbor. So I submit to you, gentlemen, that this is not a question for the committee to idly or quickly decide. We will not entertain new projects. It is an obligation of honor on the part of the Government of the United States to keep its part of the agreement. The State of Connecticut asks for the cooperation of the Government. A bill was introduced practically assuring the Government's full cooperation. In the report of the engineers they make reference to cooperation between the State of Connecticut and the Federal Government, and they find it is for Connecticut to build a pier and dig the channel and ask the Government to appropriate this money. I submit to you that the State of Connecticut has gone forward, relying on the good faith of the Army engineers, upon the report of this Congress, and not until then was the contract let. Now, then, this act passed the House last year, and I submit to you that there is no other proposition like it before Congress. While there may be other meritorious amendments that will be proposed, there is nothing just like this, in which the State of Connecticut invites cooperation of the Government. This Government, through its Army engineers, its proper officials, practically agrees, and did agree, to cooperate with us.

Mr. BURGESS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman says it was included in the last bill. Does he mean the bill that went over to the Senate and failed?

Mr. MAHAN. I mean the bill in the last Congress, that passed this House and went to the Senate.

Mr. BURGESS. And failed?

Mr. MAHAN. Went to the Senate and received the favorable report of the Senate Committee on Commerce, but failed.

Mr. BURGESS. I am sorry it failed, but it comes up as a new project now.

Mr. MAHAN. It is a question for this House as to whether we are not in honor bound to observe our agreement between a sovereign State and this Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. There is no agreement entered into to put it in the bill.

Mr. MAHAN. I submit that this amendment ought to be put in the bill by the Members of this House, assuming that you gentlemen are doing the best you can for the Treasury of the country.

Mr. BURGESS. There have been about \$20,000,000 of new projects gone out just as this has. I am very friendly with you—

Mr. MAHAN. So am I with you, and I dislike to differ with you, but I feel bound to do so.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman secured my sympathy the other day upon the statement from him that Congress had pledged its cooperation with the State of Connecticut on this proposition. Does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. MAHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman handed me the bill referred to, but I find that in the act passed there is no such cooperation pledged nor is it mentioned.

Mr. MAHAN. If I said "pledged," that is a pretty strong word. I—

Mr. LENROOT. It merely calls for a report upon the question of cooperation.

Mr. MAHAN. Yes, sir. It calls for a report. That report is embodied, so far as this report is concerned, in the report of the Army engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN] has expired.



Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to what the gentleman from Connecticut has said, I feel as if the House should act favorably upon this project. Here we have a harbor of 24 feet of present depth, 600 feet wide, with a commerce valued at \$125,000,000 annually. The proposition is to increase the present depth to 33 feet. The survey has been made by order of the Congress. The engineers have made a favorable report. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors have acted favorably upon the engineers' report. The House has acted favorably upon the report of the committee. The State of Connecticut has pledged its faith to the expenditure of a million dollars, with an understanding that the Government of the United States would cooperate whenever they had so pledged. Contracts have been let as a result of that pledge of faith. The work is now in progress. The question is whether—

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. I refuse to yield at present. The question is whether the State of Connecticut ought to be allowed to proceed with the expenditure of this \$1,000,000 for the improvement of one of the great harbors of America and to allow the expenditure of that million dollars to go to waste, when by the action of this House and of the Senate \$170,000 in this bill and \$160,000 in some succeeding bill will enable the city of New London and the State of Connecticut to establish a harbor that will accommodate foreign commerce, increase the opportunities for the transportation of the world's goods at lower rates, and enable the city of New London to employ men who otherwise might be idle, and whether, as a matter of fact, we are not in honor bound to do the thing that has been reported in favor of, as the result of which the State of Connecticut has gone forward and expended this \$1,000,000.

Now, I submit that the State of Connecticut must have felt justified in contracting such a large expenditure of money; that it must have felt it had some reason to hope and believe the Government of the United States was to cooperate with that State in the development of this harbor. New London is at a point on the Atlantic coast where shipping can be readily done. The harbor proposed to be improved, in my judgment, is one of the needs of navigation. And, aside from all that, I can not help but believe that, after the State has pledged its faith and contracted its obligations, we who represent the other States of the Union can do no less than to encourage the State of Connecticut in the development of this port which ships from every other port throughout the world may enter. It seems to me there is nothing more to be said about it. They have made a case, and that case seems to be in favor of the appropriation of the money by the Government of the United States through the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no navigable rivers in my district, and therefore have never had occasion to go before the Rivers and Harbors Committee. Hence I have not suffered any disappointments at its hands, and am in a position to dispassionately consider any amendment to this bill on its merits.

I have looked into the facts connected with this amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

This proposition almost, if not entirely, reaches the point of being a moral obligation on the part of this Government to take up at this time its part of this particular work. A joint resolution was adopted some years ago by which the Secretary of War was directed to make such investigations, inquiries, and surveys as would enable the United States Government to come into full cooperation with the State of Connecticut with respect to the improvement of this particular harbor. Not only were these investigations to be made pursuant to this resolution, but they have been actually completed. The Board of Engineers that investigated this proposition have given it their support in the most unqualified terms. It is pointed out in the report of the board, a report which I hold in my hand, that a most enormous traffic annually pours in and out of this port.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is it not true also that this port of New London is a transcontinental port?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman may be right on that point. I am not particularly advised in that respect however. But the fact is not disputed that this is a port at which an enormous aggregate of traffic is done.

The State of Connecticut acting on the intimation that on certain conditions the Federal Government would cooperate

with it, went ahead with its part of the understanding, and has expended a very large sum on the improvements of this harbor. The amount asked from the United States Government for this project in comparison with the amounts that have been recommended by the committee in favor of other and far less deserving projects, is almost negligible. Compared with the amount expended by the State of Connecticut, and having in mind the volume of traffic justifying this expenditure not only present, but prospective, I am justified in saying that there will be no more meritorious amendment offered to this bill than the one under consideration.

The only argument that I have heard against this amendment is the suggestion that the committee has decided not to take up any new projects. Really, in essence and in substance, this is not a new project, having in mind the work done, and the money already expended by the State of Connecticut. But that is merely a dictum of the committee, which enables many projects included in the bill to be taken care of, while other and far more meritorious projects are excluded from consideration, projects that have not a tithe of the merits of the pending proposition. It touches the dignity and the authority of this House, when it is asked to disregard a proposition that is presented on its merits merely because that committee has adopted a rule of convenience in its own deliberations. If we can not exercise the superior authority that attaches to this body, but must act merely on the report of a committee—which is merely the instrument, or hand of this House—then why this farce of continuing further under circumstances of apparent deliberation? Why not at once rise, and report the bill to the House just as it has been brought before this House by the committee, and thus end this discussion? Why waste our breath in the farcical effort of pretending to consider propositions on their merits, when in reality we are doing nothing of the sort?

Mr. Chairman, the figures in this connection emphasize and support in the very strongest way all that I have said. Permit me to bring these figures to the attention of the committee. Mind you, they are not capable of contradiction, because they are contained in the report of Col. W. M. Black of the Corps of Engineers, and senior member of the board. This report was made in 1913. In that report he says:

2. The present commerce of the harbor is practically all coastwise and amounts to about 900,000 tons, having a value of about \$107,000,000. It consists principally of steamboat freight, coal, and lumber. Some foreign commerce is carried on, it being reported that 3 foreign vessels entered and 15 cleared from the port, and 2 American vessels entered from and 4 cleared for foreign ports.

3. The district officer states that the harbor is in many respects admirably adapted for development as an ocean port. It is approached by easily navigated deep water, is in a sheltered position, has a small tidal range, which is advantageous from a standpoint of terminal construction and operation, is rarely, if ever, closed by ice, and is used extensively as a harbor of refuge. The improvement now desired is an entrance channel of sufficient size to accommodate ocean-going steamships. The natural depth of 26 feet now available is not deemed sufficient for vessels of that class.

4. It is stated that in anticipation of a foreign commerce the State of Connecticut has purchased lands and is about to enter upon the construction of a commodious and modern pier 1,000 feet long, with suitable connections, and to excavate to a depth of 35 feet at mean low water slips alongside and connecting with the main channel, this work to be done under a State appropriation of \$1,000,000. The furnishing of this modern terminal and its connection with the main entrance channel is the cooperation offered by the State in the development of this port. The district officer states that the commerce will be carried in vessels not exceeding 30 feet in draft, and for their accommodation he proposes a channel depth of 33 feet at mean low water and a width of 600 feet. The estimated cost of securing such a channel is \$330,000 and \$2,000 annually for maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if any confirmation is needed of what has been said by my colleague [Mr. MAHAN] and by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], I wish to read very briefly what Maj. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers, has to say on this project and concerning the commerce of that harbor. I read:

While the commerce which is expected to follow the proposed improvement can not be forecast with certainty, yet it is highly improbable that such a large and well-appointed terminal as that which the State proposes to provide will go unused, and a considerable commerce may be expected to follow the improvement. In view of the natural advantages of the harbor and the relatively small cost of improvement, I am of the opinion that New London Harbor is worthy of improvement by the General Government to the extent of providing a channel 33 feet deep at mean low water from the natural deep water in the upper harbor to Long Island Sound, at a cost of \$330,000 for original construction and an amount estimated at \$2,000 per annum for maintenance. The work should be prosecuted at such rate as to secure its completion in two years. If the project is adopted by Congress, the amount of \$170,000 should be provided as an initial appropriation and



a continuing contract authorized to include the remaining amount of \$100,000.

In compliance with the provisions of the act, I further report that the cooperation by the State of Connecticut in the improvement of New London Harbor and its approaches should consist in the construction of a pier and terminal of the character proposed by the rivers, harbors, and bridges commission of the State, and in the excavation of the channel to connect this pier with the main channel; and I recommend that the entering into contracts covering the essential portions of this work by the proper agencies of the State of Connecticut should be a condition precedent to the expenditure of the funds that may be appropriated by Congress for the excavation of the main channel.

Those contracts have been entered into by the State of Connecticut to the extent of three-quarters of a million dollars, and by next year the entire amount of the appropriation by the State—\$1,000,000—will be expended and those piers and docks built; and the result will be, unless you make the appropriation to the extent asked in this amendment, the State will have provided these magnificent piers and terminals, and you can not get to them, because the United States Government has failed to keep at least its implied agreement with the State of Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is essentially a new project. It is not a new project because of the dictum of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but it is such a project as has been uniformly considered and treated by Congress as a new project. So that, in dealing with this, do not get the impression that you are not dealing with a new project, because you are.

I am not going to say anything about the merits of this proposition. We passed upon it last winter, when we were dealing with new projects. When we were preparing the bill of 1914 this matter was presented to us. We went over it and regarded it then as a good project, as one that should receive the favorable consideration of our committee and of the Congress. We passed the 1914 bill with this in it, subject to the conditions imposed.

When we came to prepare this bill we were confronted with the question as to whether we would take on any new projects at all. We considered the question very thoroughly, from every angle, from every standpoint. Perhaps I violate no confidence when I say that before beginning the preparation of the bill we consulted with the President of the United States about the policy to be pursued; and while he was emphatic in his statement that we should allow a sufficient amount of money to maintain projects, that we should take no chances on that, he cautioned us to be very careful in the matter of prosecuting work on old projects, and asked us, because of Treasury conditions, to allow only enough money to carry on those projects economically and with a fair degree of dispatch until another bill could be framed. So far as new projects were concerned, he advised against taking them on at this time.

I further talked with gentlemen on both sides of this House as to what should be done. Other members of the committee did the same thing, and the result of this discussion and deliberation was that we decided to have no new projects in this bill. I do not mind saying that if we were taking on new projects this is one that I would favor. At first we thought it would be advisable to make some exceptions, but when we came to draw the line it was difficult to do so. Where could we draw the line? Other projects would come up for consideration. I know of several others that I think just as urgent as this; in fact, I am sure that they are just as urgent as this particular project. If this were to be taken on, those ought to be taken on also. In fact, along with this project that we adopted in the 1914 bill we adopted 75 other new projects, quite a number of them being adopted subject to conditions of local contribution of one kind or another.

This is a very commendable work these people are undertaking to do there. But let me call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to this fact, that up to this present moment the House is under no moral or other kind of obligation to the people there to respond to their proposition. We had provided for a survey and invited suggestions as to what cooperation should be furnished by the people there, but that does not commit Congress to any action. We are standing here to-day in a condition where we may or may not proceed with it, as Congress sees proper.

Mr. CONRY. Does not the gentleman think that under all the circumstances of this case there is an implied obligation on the part of the Government to make this improvement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not sure but I could answer that either way and tell the truth. It depends altogether on the way a man looks at it, whether he thinks it is an obligation or not. I know the people out in California claim, with reference to the Sacramento River, that we are under obligation to them to take on a project in this bill that would call for over \$5,000,000, and so far as local cooperation is concerned that is on all fours with this. Perhaps it presents a stronger case, because this proposition which we are now discussing is not to aid the Government in doing the work the Government is called upon to do but is to furnish terminal facilities, a very commendable thing to be sure. The Government ought to respond liberally to cases of this kind whenever it can.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Just a question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. The gentleman spoke about a question that he could answer either way. If an authorized agent of the Government, charged with certain work, should recommend that before the Government does this particular work the State of Connecticut shall do a certain thing, and the State of Connecticut goes ahead and does that thing, is there not an implied obligation on the part of the National Government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I do not go that far with this particular project, though it is commendable in them to undertake that. They have anticipated the action of Congress. They assumed that Congress would act favorably, and I think they were justified in that assumption, for whenever we reach new projects I, for one, shall favor this particular project. But as I said a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, this is not to assist the Government in the work. The intention is to furnish terminal facilities for public use.

Mr. MAHAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAHAN. Does the gentleman think that he is justified in asking Members of this House to vote against this project and to uphold the committee in the determination that no new project shall be considered this year, and for that reason not to include this project, when this matter received the favorable report of your committee and passed this House at its last session, and received the favorable report of the committee of the Senate, and upon the failure of this Congress to act the State of Connecticut will lose the interest on a million dollars for three years?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think the gentleman's premises are correct.

Mr. MAHAN. They are absolutely accurate, and the gentleman knows they are.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not consider them so.

Mr. MAHAN. Then the gentleman has not examined the facts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the failure to adopt this project is going to keep the State of Connecticut from doing whatever work it can do there, and I do not think the failure of Congress to adopt the project at this time, provided we do adopt it in the next bill and have a bill at the next session of Congress, is going to delay the State of Connecticut one minute.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I want to ask the gentleman whether it is a fact that there are no new projects in this measure?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No new projects in the bill up to date, and I call the attention of the committee to what will confront us if we open the door. As I said a minute ago, I at first thought it was advisable to make some few exceptions, but on talking with the members of the committee to that end they did not know where to draw the line. Nobody could say. We had 76 new projects in the other bill. If we take up this project, every Member who had a new project in the bill of last year will come back on us and say, "If you put in this one, put in ours."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want anyone here to suppose that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is disposed to regard a bill prepared by them as a sacred one that can not be amended, for of course it can be if this House wants to do it; but I wish to call attention to this one thing, that if you open the door here perhaps it ought to be opened in some other cases, just how many I would not undertake to say now.

I have three or four or five in my mind, so have others, no doubt, and there is no predicting where the matter would end.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. The gentleman thinks there is merit in this proposition, but thinks it ought not to be taken on at the present time. Why not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Because we are not adopting new projects, as we do not think Treasury conditions will justify us in taking on new work. We have \$250,000,000 of old work on our hands now, and I believe the amount we are appropriating is as much as we can afford now.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. The gentleman thinks it might be taken on at the next session?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; if we have new projects, this will probably be one of them.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. What assurance has the gentleman that the condition of the Treasury will be any better than now?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no assurance as to that, but I should hope the Treasury situation would be better. I believe it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is pertinent to this inquiry, because I believe the gentleman from Connecticut did not attack the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, as was done yesterday by one or two others, on the ground of alleged favoritism by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to its own members, but I do want to say that while it is not a pleasant thing to talk about, especially not so to me, I nevertheless wish to notice these charges briefly.

I wish to say that if there is such discrimination, then you have not the kind of a committee you ought to have, and you should reorganize it and have another one appointed at once, for this great committee should be composed of men not capable of such action or practices. If the men on the committee are not honest and honorable enough to conduct the affairs with which they are charged without discrimination and favoritism, then they are in the wrong place and others should be placed in their stead.

But let me say to you there was no favoritism anywhere, certainly not with reference to the new projects, because every project is placed on the same footing, for none have been adopted, and if you want to consider States, every State was placed on the same basis so far as new projects were concerned.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish first. There has been no new project taken on for Florida, Alabama, Texas, or any other State, whether represented on the committee or not. Therefore there can not have been any discrimination along that line.

Mr. MAHAN. Will the gentleman kindly state what the appropriations in this bill are for Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am coming to that, though it has nothing to do with new projects. Take the State of Connecticut. I am now replying to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] more particularly. There are seven new projects pending in Connecticut. The State of Florida had 12. Therefore, while we left off 7 for the State of Connecticut, we left off 12 for the State of Florida. There were 2 new projects for Maine, 3 for Massachusetts, and all those were left out. There were 9 from New York, and all those were left out. There were 8 from New Jersey, and all those were left out. Eight from Maryland, 2 for Alabama, 5 for Louisiana, and 6 for Texas. So, I say, there has been no discriminations along that line.

Now, so far as old projects are concerned, how did the committee act with reference to those? We acted upon the recommendations of the engineers in the main.

There were recommended for the State of Florida appropriations for old projects of a little over \$1,400,000. Over \$500,000 of that were eliminated by the committee at my suggestion, and there has been, I believe, no criticism of my action in that regard, though one Member did on the floor yesterday criticize the improvement at St. Lucie Inlet. But we kept off over one-third of the estimates furnished by the War Department for work in the State of Florida. For the district I represent, which has a commerce of approximately 5,000,000 tons, there are \$187,000 recommended in this bill. There are \$926,000 in all, and my district out of that gets only \$187,000. Certainly I did not discriminate in my own favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The reduction in the State of Florida was 36 per cent. That in Maine was 18 per cent. For Massachusetts there was no reduction, because while there was a reduction in one place there was an increase in another, the latter being more than an offset to the former.

In Texas the reduction was 36 per cent, the same as Florida, although there was no intention to make them just the same. Now, the gentleman from Connecticut on the floor yesterday took up Texas and Florida, and said: "See what you have done in Texas and Florida; they have got so many million dollars." That is no argument and no fair illustration. He could have made the same argument by taking up the States of Ohio and Florida. He could have said the Little Orange River in Florida gets \$1,000 while Ohio gets \$5,000,000, and thus show that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] and myself, who were on the committee, received \$5,001,000. That is a more striking illustration than the one he used. But there is nothing in such an argument. We are dealing with projects, not with States. We have not discriminated in favor of members of the committee. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. The gentleman said there was no new project in the bill, but only old projects to be cared for. I would like to know how much the appropriations are for old projects for certain States represented by members on the committee as compared to the old projects in other States not represented on the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have the list here that I started to read, but it would take up too much time.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I call to mind my own State, and I have in mind others. Take the Ouachita River. There is the case of the Ouachita River, which the engineers recommended, \$706,000. That is an old and continuing project, 15 years old, and it receives by this bill \$25,000. Then there is the Red River on which the engineers recommended a scheme of \$6,000,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And I want to say to the gentleman that that is a project that will need very careful consideration before it is adopted.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. The gentleman has fortified himself behind the Board of Engineers on old and continuing projects, but it seems from rather a cursory observation of the bill on its face that it happens that most of these old and continuing projects are cared for in those States that are represented on the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I deny that. We have only followed the estimates of the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to get some information. I do not understand the definition of "new projects." I want to ask the chairman of the committee or some man on the committee the meaning of that phrase. I find here, in looking at the RECORD, of yesterday, that a member of the committee stated that for a project in Florida the bill recommends an appropriation of \$100,000, and there had been expended only seventy-odd dollars on that. I presume the chairman of the committee will call that an old project, continuing an improvement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is an old project.

Mr. DONOVAN. I am not ready to have the question answered yet. Let me continue.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the gentleman was asking a question.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to have the gentleman answer the question when I am through with it. One hundred thousand dollars for a place with practically not a dollar expended upon it. That is termed an old improvement. A member of the committee, I believe, stated yesterday that some seventy-odd dollars has been expended upon this. I notice further in looking through the bill some thirty-odd projects in the same State, all called continuing an improvement—a peculiar terminology, a new school of grammar—continuing improvements. The report of the district engineer, the report of the Board of Engineers, in language of their own, stated in the Connecticut proposition that it was a modification of three different years, but that is a new project under the committee's dictionary, while in Florida it is a continuing improvement; and it strikes me that the average boy in school will say that a modification of a report of 1909, 1907, and 1910 is an old



project, continuing an improvement, or continuing a work, and where there has not been a dollar spent on a hundred-thousand-dollar project, as asked for, it is somewhat doubtful if any disinterested person could be found who would say that it was an old improvement. It is a bit of legerdemain in English that I can not appreciate. But I notice there is a lot of fertility, just the same, in the committee's action when you find in Florida thirty-odd propositions, totaling nearly a million dollars. Ah, Mr. Chairman, a gentleman from the Orient, sometimes known as a "Chink," would look with envy upon the blandishments of the committee and wish that he was a resident of Florida or a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, just one moment. That is a project adopted some two years ago, and has not been modified in any manner or form since its adoption. The money appropriated for it was tied up there, because they said they did not have money enough to go on with the work, but that if additional funds should be authorized or furnished the work would proceed. That is therefore the justification for the appropriation in the bill for St. Lucie Inlet.

Mr. KETTNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It might be well for this committee to understand that the Board of Army Engineers has indorsed and recommended 133 new projects in which we are all more or less interested, and which would amount to more than \$100,000,000. I can state personally that five members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had new projects that they wanted adopted, but the committee turned them down. If the committee sees fit to adopt new projects, I think it should treat all of the Members alike and adopt the 133 new projects and add another \$100,000,000 to the bill in place of the \$34,000,000 that the committee has reported to this House. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has given its time and study to this bill and in every way has cut down so as to bring it within reason and within the present condition of our finances.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I am the friend of all river and harbor improvements, but the condition of the Treasury and the country forces me to take the position that this is no time to take on any new projects. There were six in my State that went out under that rule. They were included in the bill last year, as was this project, but the bill failed in the Senate. There were 76 new projects taken on in the bill last year which went out of this bill for this reason. The engineers, in making the estimates for old work, recommended \$49,000,000. We realized, and every man must realize, that no such bill of that kind could pass at this time. So, after six weeks of earnest work on this matter, cutting everywhere, as the chairman has stated, cutting 36 per cent off the recommendations for Texas alone, we succeeded in reporting this bill to the House carrying \$34,000,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. May I ask the gentleman if it is a fact that no project which was considered new in the bill last year, although it was incorporated in that bill, has been carried in this bill?

Mr. BURGESS. No project at all.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In the view of the committee, what is a new project? I ask this in all sincerity, because I am having trouble at home upon the subject.

Mr. BURGESS. Work that has never been adopted in the law before.

That is as plain as can be. There is no occasion for any misunderstanding about it.

Mr. CONRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Certainly.

Mr. CONRY. The gentleman says that a new project is one that has never been adopted, I believe.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. CONRY. Now is it not true that the gentleman from Connecticut has reference to a project that had been approved in the House bill?

Mr. BURGESS. No; only by the House.

Mr. CONRY. The gentleman means not by the Senate?

Mr. BURGESS. I mean it never became a law. In order to be an old project it must be approved by the House and Senate and be signed by the President.

Mr. CONRY. The gentleman did not make himself clear in the first statement.

Mr. BURGESS. Then I will make myself clear now. Now, of course, the House can do as it pleases, and I reckon it will. It has the power to do so. It has the power to take on any new project, defeat the bill, or anything else that it chooses. I am

only one instrument, 1 Member of 435, but I will tell you I am getting very tired of being skinned by Members who do not know "straight up" on this floor. I have been on this River and Harbor Committee for 12 years. I have worked faithfully and tried my best to do the best for the rivers and harbors of the country, but I am tired of all this ceaseless rattletrap nonsense.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I think the membership of this House want the right thing done, and if we are in the wrong we want to be put right as to any erroneous conclusions we may have drawn; but in looking over the estimates made by the Board of Engineers and the appropriations carried in this bill, it strikes one upon first blush, as we generally say, that there has been some discrimination, and that idea pervades the House. Whether it is true or not, I think this debate should disclose it; but in looking over the bill the estimates made by the engineers and the amounts carried in the bill in States represented by gentlemen on this committee seem to correspond largely all along the line, whereas in those States not represented on the committee few projects are cared for in the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon; he is greatly mistaken about that.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. If I could take the time to do it, I could call them off here one after the other.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I hope the gentleman will ask his question.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I will say this: In the State of Texas—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. In the State of Texas the engineers estimated \$100,000 for Galveston Channel and the bill carries \$250,000. Now, I would like to have some one explain why the committee gave two and one-half times as much as the engineers estimated?

Mr. BURGESS. They did not; the gentleman is greatly mistaken about that.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I do not think I am mistaken in the figures.

Mr. BURGESS. I know the gentleman is.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. What are the proper estimates for the item carried in the bill at Galveston Channel?

Mr. BURGESS. There was recommended \$200,000—

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Galveston Channel? The estimate for Galveston Channel for 1916 was \$100,000.

Mr. BURGESS. We have not got to Galveston yet, and we will discuss that when we get to it. We are discussing the proposition of New London, Conn., and I do not want the gentleman to get off from that. The question for the committee to determine is whether new projects go in this bill or not. That was the question raised by my friend DONOVAN; that is the question raised by my friend MAHAN; and that is the question to be settled by the committee—whether new projects go on the bill. Everybody ought to understand what a new project is, although it seems some do not, but if this new project goes on, why, it opens up the floodgates, because that will be discrimination. That is what we want to try to avoid. If we adopt this project the others, just as meritorious as this, will want to go on. Then what are you going to do?

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. I want to ask if it is the custom of the committee to appropriate for maintenance of new projects. The gentleman calls this a new project, and yet the committee is appropriating \$14,500 for maintenance.

Mr. BURGESS. That is the maintenance for an old project.

Mr. GOULDEN. An old project, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. The gentleman says this is a new project, and yet at the same time the House passed it once before.

Mr. BURGESS. That is true, but the House only passed on it and the bill failed; it did not become a law, so we are back just where we were before.

Mr. LEVY. Well, I do not call it a new project.

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman can call it what he chooses, but it is a new project. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. BURGESS. Certainly.

Mr. JACOWAY. I will ask the gentleman if he thinks all old projects that have been approved by the Board of Engineers of the War Department should in some way be taken care of? What is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. BURGESS. My opinion is that they ought to be taken care of the best we can, and we have tried to do that in this bill.

Mr. JACOWAY. If any in this bill have been left out, I will ask the gentleman to state to the committee the compelling cause as to why they were omitted from the bill?

Mr. BURGESS. Because we thought there was money enough to take care of them.

Mr. JACOWAY. From what source, might I add?

Mr. BURGESS. From funds on hand—

Mr. JACOWAY. That is all.

Mr. BURGESS. And available.

Mr. BALTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Certainly.

Mr. BALTZ. I notice the Committee on Rivers and Harbors oppose any amendment which is offered on this floor. The committee wants the bill to pass as it came from the committee. Now, has the committee any assurance from the Senate that the bill will pass in its original form?

Mr. BURGESS. I am glad the gentleman asked that. We have not, but we hope that it will; but if the committee puts amendments on, amendment after amendment, I think you will defeat all river and harbor legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman think it is rather an indication of weakness on the part of the House to stand by a policy of economy like that merely because of danger of defeat in the Senate?

Mr. BURGESS. Well, no; I think that is prudent. We have to consider the way legislation is carried on. We must, if we are sensible men, do that. No bill can become a law unless it passes the House, passes the Senate, and has the signature of the President. That may be the difficulty with our system of legislation, but that is the fact, and everybody ought to recognize it.

Mr. MOORE. I agree with the gentleman that the committee ought to be supported and upheld in the recommendations it has made so far as possible, but it does appear to me that a fixed policy of no new projects is a dangerous thing, and that the committee may not always be able to maintain it, because it invites a condition in the Committee of the Whole that the committee does not want.

Mr. BURGESS. That is true; but a delicate situation comes up in regard to that matter. If we are going to take on a new project, then how will we keep from another new project, and another one, and another new one, and so on, endlessly? So, the only way is to adopt a straight rule against all individuals and all projects.

Mr. MOORE. In the case of the project we are now considering the Senate acted favorably, we are informed.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. So this might be distinguished from the general run of cases?

Mr. BURGESS. It might be, but could not be. It is a new project just as much as any of the others. There were 24 projects in the last bill that had conditions. There were 74 new projects. All of those have gone out, every one of them, without discussion of the merits. Nobody is opposed to the New London proposition at all. We reported it unanimously the last time. It will get the money if there is another river and harbor bill, and the contribution made by the State of Connecticut can go ahead just the same. There is no cooperation except in a general way, because that was for terminals, and all that, independent of an appropriation for dredging out the channel which they will get next year if there is an appropriation bill. And now it is better—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman want more time?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that the time of the gentleman from Texas may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a further question now?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The point I was trying to make was not in opposition to the committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I understand that.

Mr. MOORE. I will not join in any attempt to overthrow the work of the committee or saddle down its work so that the bill will be defeated. I do not believe in undertaking now to stampede the committee; but the committee, having taken its position, has invited the opposition of those who were unable to get their new projects recognized, and therefore some such discussion as this was to be expected. My point is that when we are considering the element of time in the completion of a contract, for instance, like the proposition at New London, whether the committee, yielding to the House, might not make such an exception without in any way prejudicing its stand for the bill as reported. It does not mean a stampede. It means the treatment of an individual case from the floor of the House by way of suggestion to the committee.

Mr. BURGESS. There were 24 projects in the last bill that did not become law, but that were similar to this. If we break down this bill, you will know the result. It is not that I oppose New London. It is not that I oppose Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. MAHAN. I have not two better friends in the House than they are. It hurts me to oppose them, and I feel as kindly to them and their districts and their States as anybody in this House; but I insist that we ought to think of what we are doing.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. The gentleman and other members of the committee have had a great deal to say about new projects. Is it not a fact that a new project could remain a new project indefinitely until it was provided for by the committee?

Mr. BURGESS. Of course.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Following that up, I will say that I have in mind a great many projects that were recommended strongly a good many years ago by the Board of Engineers that have not yet been inaugurated or provided for by appropriations hailing from the gentleman's committee.

Mr. BURGESS. That is true. If a man serves 8 or 10 years on a committee, he will see what difficulty he is in, and he would get restless against all the kinds of criticism that are being offered on this floor. It makes me sorry that I am in Congress, sorry that I am on any committee. I get disgusted, when a man tries to do his best and serve his country faithfully, when I come here and get abused and called a "grafter," and all that kind of thing. I tell you it is wrong. This bill is as fair a bill as ever came from any committee, and was drawn with the greatest care.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes; a question.

Mr. DONOVAN. A question.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, ask it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Would he call it an old project if it had been passed by Congress, had become an act, further amended the next year in another continuing act, and a third time passed Congress, continuing the improvement, which would make three acts of Congress? Would that be an old or new work?

Mr. BURGESS. It looks to me like it would be three years' old.

Mr. DONOVAN. The Bridgeport act was enacted by Congress in 1899, and was further continued by an act of 1909, and further in 1910.

Mr. BURGESS. No.

Mr. DONOVAN. And if there was such a thing as an old act, that was one. As I understand—

Mr. BURGESS. You are entirely mistaken.

Mr. DONOVAN. Oh, I see.

Mr. BURGESS. That has been threshed over. We want to go on with the bill.

Mr. DONOVAN. I see.

(Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!")

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this project that is before the House for consideration is a meritorious one. There is no doubt about that. It is probably one of the most meritorious new propositions that has come before the committee. But it is not any more so than several others throughout the country.



But it is not a question of merit in this case. It is a question of what you are going to do under present circumstances when you have no money, or have not sufficient money, to take on new projects. You have to draw the line in this bill somewhere.

Here is the situation which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors meets: We find that, due to certain conditions—we will not discuss why, but due to certain conditions—we have not the money to carry on the present river and harbor projects and take on new ones. We all know we are to-day paying a direct tax; \$100,000,000 of direct taxes is being levied on the people to pay the expenses of Government. We had to take into consideration that fact.

What did the committee do under the circumstances? We said, "The thing to do is to take care of the Government property, to keep it from deteriorating, to keep the Government from losing money, and to take on no other new projects."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not now. We said, "The thing to do is to take on no new projects." We could not refuse to appropriate very well to maintain Government property and let millions of dollars worth of property be destroyed, or places where contracts were already let, where the work was already being done. We could not refuse to appropriate for it without tying up those plants and without bringing millions of dollars of loss to the country, so that the committee, not on the basis of merit, had to draw the line somewhere. We said, "We will take on no new projects. The Government has no property in new projects that is being lost, no contracts have been let, and no material assembled, and no men are there for the purpose of carrying on this work."

It is not a question of merit, although this is a meritorious proposition. We will take it on when we can reach it. But when you go to work and pick out one project and say that this project must receive the special favor of Congress, it would be inconsistent. Why, there is a gentleman on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. KETTNER, of California, whose constituents are interested in a project already under way on the Sacramento River. In California they are offering to pay \$3 for every dollar that the Government will pay on that project. It is a project of great merit. We said, "No; you must wait," although they have \$35,000,000 worth of commerce on that river and carried last year 212,000 passengers. There is a project of great merit in my own State, at Willapa Harbor, that has two-thirds of the tonnage of New London, but I did not act that the work there should be begun, although it was being urged by my people. I said, "You must draw the line somewhere. We have not the money."

Do you want to defeat the entire bill and load it up so that it all goes out? Do you not think the committee does right in keeping the Government's property intact and caring for work already under construction?

I can point out in Oregon a new project calling for only \$1,800 expenditure upon a small creek that has \$102,000,000 worth of commerce upon it, and they are asking for only \$1,800, and the city of Portland is appropriating half a million dollars each year for the commerce that goes on it. If you are talking about merit, I call your attention to that. Half a million dollars is appropriated by the local authorities each year, and \$102,000,000 worth of commerce is carried on that stream.

That is in my own jurisdiction, so far as representation on the committee is concerned. It is not a question of merit. Let us treat everybody alike in this House. If there is any member of the committee who is receiving undue favor in this bill, I will vote to take it away if you point it out. We ought not to do it. The men on the committee, if they favor themselves, are unfit to serve upon that committee, and unfit to be Members of this House. [Applause.]

This is not a "pork barrel," gentlemen. But if you are going to come here on the floor of the House and pick out certain projects and stand up here and say the appropriations must be made for the States, not for merit, and that we must favor this project because it is in a State where the Representative has not received anything, that would be putting it on a "pork-barrel" basis. It is not a question of States. It is a question of the necessity of commerce; and I ask this committee to vote down that amendment for that reason, in order that we may appropriate only sufficient amount of money to take care of the projects where the work is already in progress. Let us treat everybody alike. Every man ought to be willing to this. [Applause.]

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard a few minutes. I am sure when gentlemen charge that there has

been discrimination in this bill they do so under a misapprehension. I am sure no gentleman wants to be unfair to his colleagues.

The question under consideration at this time is the New London (Conn.) project, and the district in which it is located is ably represented by my good friend, Mr. MAHAN. We have made no discrimination thus far in favor of any member of the committee or any Member of the House as to new projects, and no gentleman can rise in his place and point out a single new project in this bill.

Now, because we have a kindly feeling for our good friend, Mr. MAHAN, are we going to say to the country that because Mr. MAHAN, who is popular with the membership of this House, has a new project that he wants put on, a discrimination will be made in favor of him and his district?

Why, my friends, in the State of Georgia there are four new projects. My friend from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] defined what a new project is. A new project is one that has not heretofore been approved by law.

The committee had to draw a line somewhere. The proposition came up as to whether any new projects would be put on. I for one favored new projects, but we knew that in the interest of economy this bill had to be held down, so we did not appropriate for any new projects.

Now, if you put on this new project, because of Mr. MAHAN's influence in the House, what answer have I to give to the people of Savannah, the great city that I come from, a city with a commerce of 3,154,087 tons, valued at \$360,536,275 a year? They have a new project for a turning basin. I would have been delighted to see it go on, but we could not get it because they were putting on no new projects. Yet gentlemen come in here and offer their amendments on the floor of the House for new projects, and charge the committee with discriminating against them. Why, gentlemen, it has not been in the mind of any member of the committee to discriminate against anybody. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN] has no better friend on the floor of the House than I am to him; but what answer can I give to the people of my district and the people of Georgia when they say to me, "The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN] was able to rise on the floor of the House, and although not a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to put an amendment on the bill for a new project, while you, a member of the committee, were not able to get a new project that we so much desired"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the gentleman inform us what is the amount of new projects that have been proposed and favorably recommended?

Mr. EDWARDS. There are 134 of them, approximating, I understand, something like \$150,000,000, favorably passed upon by the engineers.

Mr. RUSSELL. And there are new projects that have been shut out by the committee which, if put on, would increase it about \$150,000,000?

Mr. EDWARDS. Approximately it would increase it about \$150,000,000 if all of them were put on.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the committee thinks that the bill, as now reported to the House, containing old projects, is just as much as the condition of the Treasury will permit?

Mr. EDWARDS. Absolutely, and in trying to frame the bill on an equitable basis we have treated every project upon its merits. We have not observed State lines, but we have taken up the report of the engineers and appropriated for the various projects of the country as their necessities seemed to urge and upon the merits of each project itself.

Mr. RUPLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. With pleasure.

Mr. RUPLEY. What is the difference between a project in which the Government has invested its money, which project is not completed, and a project in which a State has invested its money upon recommendation of engineers of the Government in compliance with a resolution of Congress? Why is not the project in which the State has its money invested, upon those inducements, in the same category as a project in which the Government has its money invested?

Mr. EDWARDS. The New London (Conn.) project has never been approved by Congress. It has never been approved by law. It is a new project, and you can not get away from it. If you want to break down this bill, load it with these new projects and fix it so that it will never become a law; just open the gate and put them on. I should really like to see the project of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN] passed, and I should like to see every other new project that is worthy put



on the bill if that were possible, but it is not possible if we really hope for the passage of the bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. With pleasure.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I want to ask the gentleman, in whom I have the utmost confidence—

Mr. EDWARDS. Which is reciprocated most heartily.

Mr. DUPRÉ. If he will give me the assurance that no project for which no appropriation has heretofore been made is provided for in this bill?

Mr. EDWARDS. I understand; there is no new project in this bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. No project for which no previous appropriation has been made by Congress?

Mr. EDWARDS. There is no project in this bill that has not heretofore been adopted by Congress.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How about the question I asked, whether there is any project for which no appropriation has heretofore been made by Congress?

Mr. EDWARDS. I think it is true that there is no such project in the bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am not hostile to the committee. I am trying to ascertain what the facts are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. The gentleman from Louisiana is friendly to river and harbor improvements.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I should think so, living, as I do, behind the Mississippi River.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not the committee has ever considered discontinuing some of the unmeritorious projects which have been started, and whether it would not be advisable, instead of stopping all new projects, to shut off for awhile the flow of money which is going to certain projects which have been universally condemned as having no merit behind them?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Which one?

A MEMBER. Name one.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will say to the gentleman that we have not only considered that, but we have cut off some that did not meet the approval of the committee because of an apparent lack of merit to warrant appropriations.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I wish to say that it is just such statements as that made by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] which throw discredit on river and harbor legislation. When he denounces certain projects as unmeritorious he ought to designate which ones they are, and not becloud the whole issue in that manner. [Applause.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. On the subject of there being no new project in the bill I do not question the correctness of the gentleman's statement, but my research has led me to a different conclusion. In the State of Mississippi, Pascagoula Harbor, as I see it, is a new project, and there is an appropriation of \$110,000 for it. Now, if that is an old project and a continuing project, I would like information upon that.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is an old project.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That project was adopted in bills heretofore passed.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. What appropriations have been made for it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The project was adopted originally for \$387,000, on condition that the local communities contribute a certain amount, approximately \$100,000.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Have these conditions been met and complied with?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. They have.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I have not been able to run that down. When was that done?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The bill of 1912 or 1913, I forget which, made the appropriation.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I will now ask the gentleman from Georgia about the Delaware River, where it says there was no estimate, but \$1,500,000 was appropriated.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is an old project.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated that the committee had discontinued some nonmeritorious projects. I am going to ask him to name one of them.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will not say they were not meritorious projects, but we have failed to appropriate for a few since I have been on the committee because we did not see merit in them. I can not designate them without reference to the records of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I ask permission to print as a part of my remarks a letter written by Mr. Thomas Purse, secretary of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., to the editor of Pearson's Magazine. That magazine stated there was no commerce on the Savannah River, except once in a while a log was floated down. Now, as a matter of fact, there has been a commerce of \$75,000,000 over that stream, as appears from Mr. Purse's letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The following is the article referred to:

SAVANNAH, GA., October 31, 1914.

EDITOR PEARSON MAGAZINE,

New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In your November (1914) issue appears an article entitled "The pigs and the pork," written by Mr. Judson C. Welliver, and in which the author criticizes severely appropriations made by the United States Congress for improvement of our rivers and harbors. Expenditures for the improvement of the Savannah River are referred to in the following language:

"Uncle Sam has expended \$773,527 on improvement of the Savannah River, according to the engineering authorities. As a result, an insignificant commerce, most of it in floating logs, is carried on this river. It looks like another of the wastes or near wastes of the system." A part of this statement is misleading, and the remainder is entirely erroneous.

The expenditures on the entire Savannah River, both below and above the city of Savannah, have amounted to a great deal more than \$773,527. The "insignificant commerce" which is "carried on this river" is indicated by the fact that in 1912 the exports from Savannah exceeded in value those of any other port of the United States on the Atlantic coast, excepting New York alone.

What the writer no doubt had in mind was that portion of the Savannah River north of the city of Savannah, more specifically the waterway between Savannah and Augusta. The language used by him, however, carries to the mind of the casual reader the idea that he was referring to the expenditures on the Savannah River from the ocean as far up as river navigation goes, and that his reference to "an insignificant commerce, most of which is floating logs," embraced all of the commerce passing down the Savannah River to the sea.

The United States engineers' reports show that the total expenditures to June 30, 1913, on the Savannah River between Savannah and Augusta, both for improvements and for maintenance, amounted to \$773,528.04. Since the author of the article in question manifestly obtained from the engineers' reports the figures used by him in his article, it is difficult to understand why he failed to secure from authoritative sources of a similar nature his figures as to the commerce carried on the Savannah River.

According to the engineer's report, the Savannah River above Savannah is navigable to Augusta, a distance of 202 miles. Previous to its improvement there were numerous shoals in the river with less than 3 feet at normal low water. Other obstructions consisted of overhanging trees, snags, and sunken logs. The original project, submitted September 22, 1880, provided for securing a channel of 5 feet in depth and 80 feet in width by means of removing snags, trees, sand bars, and protection of banks, at a cost of \$93,480.08. The amount expended upon the work under the project of 1890 to June 30, 1913, was \$680,046.95 (of which \$148,426.14 was for maintenance), which, added to the amount previously expended, gives a total expenditure on this work of \$773,527.04. In other words, for an expenditure of \$680,047 from 1890 to 1913, the amount of commerce that has been handled on the Savannah River by boats between Savannah and Augusta, Ga., has amounted to approximately 2,000,000 tons, of an approximate valuation of \$75,000,000. Cotton alone was valued at about \$8,000,000.

The effect of the improvements upon freight rates has been a reduction of from 30 per cent to 50 per cent, according to the nature of the commodities.

The part of Mr. Welliver's article reading, "As a result, an insignificant commerce, most of it in floating logs, is carried on this river," certainly is not based on facts, because, if he will take time to investigate, he will find that the value of the timber rafted down the river averages only \$300,000 annually. Take, as an illustration, the year 1910. In this year less cotton moved on the river steamers than for any year during the past 24; the value of diversified freight, excluding cotton, amounted to \$4,814,200, whilst the timber rafted for the same period amounted to \$250,000. To be more explicit, during the past 24 years the value of commerce between Savannah and Augusta was as follows: Cotton, \$8,000,000; diversified freight, \$67,000,000; total, \$75,000,000; whilst the value of timber rafted for the same period was approximately \$7,200,000.

The foregoing facts are most convincing of the fallacy of such a statement that most of the commerce handled on the Savannah River between Savannah and Augusta is floating logs. To further illustrate the benefits that have accrued by the deepening of the Savannah River between Savannah and Augusta, there is now in course of construction two steel barges 150 feet long, 30 feet beam, with a capacity of 400 tons each, at a cost of \$40,000 apiece; and it is contemplated in the near future that two more barges will be built to handle the increasing commerce that has developed, due to the increased depth of water. The barges in question will be self-propelling and are of the most modern design, operated by twin screws, with producer-gas engines, and will operate between Savannah and Augusta on a regular weekly schedule, with a speed of 7 miles per hour against the current.

As to the criticism directed generally upon the river and harbor improvements, we may state that the Federal Government has expended on the improvements of the Savannah River and Harbor from Savannah to the ocean within the past 10 years an aggregate sum of \$3,358,263, during which time foreign exports handled at Savannah have increased from \$53,770,382 to \$90,738,842, or 69 per cent. At the time of the commencement of this expenditure in 1904 the customs duties collected by the Federal Government at the customhouse at Savannah amounted



to \$54,725.44. The amount collected for the past fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, amounted to \$141,358.88, which represents an increase of 158 per cent. The customs duties collected for the past 10 years amount to \$835,595.99, which represents a direct return to the Government on the capital invested, to say nothing of the indirect benefits to the population and industries of most of the southeastern States, whose commercial interests are served through the improved facilities offered at this port. Coastwise commerce has likewise shown a most remarkable increase during the past 10 years, due to construction of larger vessels by the steamship interests making this port their terminal, brought about by the greater depth of water, thereby enabling vessels of deeper draft to proceed to the docks and depart at any state of the tide. For information it might be stated that for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, the coastwise commerce handled through the port of Savannah was approximately \$280,000,000 in value.

In view of the fact that such a misleading statement was published in your issue of November, it is hoped that this article will receive the same courteous treatment.

Yours, respectfully,

THOMAS PURSE,  
Secretary Savannah Board of Trade.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman said a while ago that the committee was taking on no new projects, and if they did take on new projects they would have to treat all alike, and it would amount to \$150,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. That would be with the House, of course. They would hardly put on that much. I take it that if the House opened up the new projects they would consider all the new projects on their merits, and if meritorious, the House would take some of them on.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman said it would amount to \$150,000,000. That means projects recommended by the engineers, and after the most scientific investigation. Now, some of us here are opposed to wasteful river and harbor appropriations, and have been for two or three years. What I want to know is if we may expect that the committee will next year take on these projects and bring in a \$150,000,000 bill?

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not speak for the committee, but for myself. No project would go into the bill unless it showed merit, and if it is meritorious it ought to be improved in its turn. If it is not meritorious, it will not get into the bill.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman said if we took the meritorious projects it would amount to \$150,000,000. He said the committee did not consider them on account of the condition of the Treasury. I want to know if we people who are opposed to these wasteful and worthless river and harbor appropriations may expect that next year, when they take on new projects, the bill will carry \$150,000,000?

Mr. EDWARDS. Oh, no; the committee will, no doubt, put in the most urgent and the most meritorious of the new projects.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Is not the effect of the gentleman's answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas that the committee will exercise judgment and weed out of the new projects those that are the most meritorious?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes; not only in the committee, but it ought to be done also on the floor of the House. The meritorious ones ought to be selected.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That means that you will accept the more urgent of the new projects. Now, why can not the House do exactly the same thing—accept those that are the most meritorious and vote out those that are not?

Mr. EDWARDS. The committee, of course, is but the instrument of the House; but after we have passed fairly upon these projects there is no reason why we should be charged with favoritism.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am making no such charge.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has been in session about five weeks. If we exclude the time taken for holidays, call it four weeks. During that time we have passed in the House four appropriation bills—the District of Columbia, the Post Office, the legislative, and the Indian appropriation bills. Last Saturday we commenced the consideration of the river and harbor bill. It is now Friday of the next week and we have read 4 pages of the bill out of 55, and have read, I believe, five or six lines to-day in addition to the amendment which has been offered. It is now 10 minutes past 3 o'clock. Congress will come to a final end at noon on the 4th of March next. Between now and then, unless we are to have a special session of Congress, there remain to be considered the Army appropriation bill, the Agricultural, the Navy, sundry civil, pension, the Military Academy, Diplomatic and Consular, and the general deficiency bills. We have passed four bills in four weeks, and we have nine bills to pass in less than seven weeks and have them become a law. I merely want to suggest that if we are

going to spend three or four hours on an amendment, or if this House is going to endeavor to make up a river and harbor bill in the Committee of the Whole, we may as well take all the time we want, because we will be here all next summer. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment again reported?

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REILLY of Connecticut) there were 44 ayes and 61 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Connecticut River, Conn.: Completing improvement and for maintenance below Hartford, \$30,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to strike out lines 6 and 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, strike out all of lines 6 and 7.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the particular amendment, which I intend to do in a moment, I wish to suggest that the remarks just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in reference to the bill before us are very pertinent, and that we all agree with them, but we have a bill before us aggregating \$34,000,000, covering 250 items, and it is not right to fail to give such a bill fair consideration. This bill has been sidetracked, as he well says, for other bills. An apple-barrel bill took two days of this House, and there was not a question about it except as to the merit of the measurement, and I voted for it. For weeks we have been spending the time of the House over a printing bill, by which it was hoped to save the Government \$750,000 a year. But here is a bill carrying \$34,000,000, with 250 items, and will you slide it through to-day or to-morrow? I agree that it is not a proper thing to take up so much time about an amendment, and I voted against the particular amendment, not that it may not have merit, but I believe, with the committee, that this is no place to build up a river and harbor bill. It strikes at the very methods of construction of this kind of legislation.

Speaking to this last amendment that was struck out, the condition there is just like the condition in the harbor of New London, of which I am now speaking. All of the wharf facilities have been owned by the railroads. We have expended \$159,000 for that harbor, 23 feet in depth it is to-day. There is no foreign shipping. Read the reports which I have here. That report shows that the steamboats carry most of the traffic outside of the coal, and who owns the steamboats? The New Haven Railroad. These improvements are largely for its benefit, as it is at Hartford. Just the same situation occurred with Portland, Me., yesterday. Read the report of the commissioner of commerce. In practically every case I have questioned thus far the harbor facilities have been controlled by this system of railroads, and they have not only controlled the terminals, but they have controlled the shipping as well. That is the condition that confronts us at New London and Hartford, and that is the reason I move to strike out, because it is a large appropriation, comparatively, \$30,000. The balance available July last was \$70,988. Past appropriations for this project reach \$873,170.

The report of the Commissioner of Commerce in this case shows that of the Hartford frontage, 18 per cent, or 1,230 feet, are owned by the New Haven road, and about the same is owned by the gas company, the Hartford Electric Light Co., and two private estates. The balance is owned by the city for park purposes. There are no piers, unless they have been constructed since this report. The New Haven Railroad owns the greatest part of the frontage on the opposite bank. What is true of that is true of the other two cases that I have cited. I do not care to present to the House at this time all these various cases, but I wish to give you one or two so that you will know that this type of harbor is for railroad terminals and railroad shipping, and this Government has continually made appropriations for such projects in the past. I believe all such propositions ought to be stricken out.

One word further. I realize that it is a disagreeable duty to raise any question in regard to these projects. I do not know in whose district they are located, and I am perfectly innocent of any personal feeling about it. I simply wish to call the attention of the House to conditions shown by Government reports. Let me say that we passed through this House a \$43,000,000 bill last year, which went over to the other side and was loaded down to the extent of \$53,000,000. That bill was killed. You would not give much time for discussion and



you laughed at discussion here. You laughed at those who raised points against it, but we were and are sincere. Simply as a question of procedure, is it not well to give some time to these different items? Defend them if you choose. All that we care to do is to quote the Engineer's report, as a rule, and show what the conditions are, and give to the House and to the country the benefit of the information thus gained. Make the appropriations if you believe them to be right; but I assure you this bill, as I view it in some particulars, is not much of an improvement over the one of last year, which was defeated.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know how many stopping points there are between the Sound and the city of Hartford, where the steamers stop?

Mr. FREAR. I do not, but I know the steamboats conducting the business are or were practically all owned by the New Haven Railroad, according to the statement of the Commissioner of Commerce.

The navigation company which owns the stock was controlled by the New Haven Railroad Co. at the time the commissioner made his report. I have all of the statistics here.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, between Hartford and Long Island Sound, a distance of 52 miles, there are 14 points along the river at which the regular steamers of the Hartford & New York Transportation Co. usually stop. They are the Hartford, Glastonbury, South Glastonbury, Middletown, Middle Haddam, Rock Landing, East Haddam or Goodspeed Landing, Hadlyme, Deep River, Broadway Landing, Elys Wharf, Essex, Lyme, and Saybrook Point. In addition to these points, there are a number of others where stops are occasionally made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hudson River, N. Y.: Continuing Improvement, \$1,500,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would hesitate to move to strike out an appropriation of that size without much study, irrespective of the fact that it may have no weight with this House; but I wish to acquaint the House with some facts that may be known to the committee, but which I do not believe are known generally. Here is an appropriation of a million and a half dollars to carry on a channel of the Hudson River to meet the canal that is being constructed in the State of New York at a cost of something like \$150,000,000. The question was submitted recently to a vote of the people of the State of New York, and they decided to build that canal. I know that there are many very able men in the State of New York who doubt very much whether there will be proportionate good results from that, but few people will question the advisability of causing the Hudson River to connect with that canal at the same depth of 12 feet in order to make the canal effective. But there are in this bill new surveys to be had. A committee that is going to economize proposes a 27-foot channel, as I now remember, for this additional distance, to cost presumably from ten to twenty million dollars. A 30-foot project is proposed up the Hudson, and this particular appropriation under which this item of \$1,500,000 is named was started at \$5,000,000, and the engineers within four years increased the estimates 50 per cent. To be accurate and give the actual figures, I find it was \$5,186,064, and inside of four years the estimate was increased to \$7,530,000. This is a large river and it has a large traffic, presumably more will come from the canal; but I call the attention of the House and the committee to the fact that in these new surveys which you are putting in you have some tremendously large items. If you want to economize, why put them in at this time?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR (continuing). In a moment. In relation to the statement of the chairman that we are gradually going to remove the waterway obligations to which we are being committed, why, it is increasing very fast, and all you have to do is to study the road you are traveling to see you are traveling fast into deeper debt, and the obligations are becoming greater constantly.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Just one question. As I understood the gentleman, he stated that New York bonded itself to the extent of \$110,000,000 for the deepening—

Mr. FREAR. Increased it \$150,000,000 to complete.

Mr. COOPER. Well, \$150,000,000 to deepen the Erie Canal. This proposition is for the United States Government to connect up that magnificent canal with the Hudson River, and so have a means of getting freight from Buffalo and the Great Lakes right straight on down to the ocean?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Now, is not that a very wise thing for the Government of the United States to do?

Mr. FREAR. Has the gentleman finished his question? If the gentleman had been listening to what I said, he would have known I said it was; but the surveys ordered will in all probability require twenty or thirty million dollars, and which have no relation to this 12-foot canal. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. I understand that this \$150,000,000 is to deepen the Hudson River up to the mouth of the canal?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is \$150,000,000. Now, what is the estimate on the \$5,000,000 project to complete that?

Mr. FREAR. Seven million dollars. It was originally \$5,000,000, and the engineers, those gentlemen on whom we depend so strongly, jumped it 50 per cent in four years.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Now, they want to make that Erie Canal a 12-foot canal. How many years will it take them to get that canal deepened to a 12-foot canal? Have they ever made any estimate of that at all?

Mr. FREAR. I can not answer the question.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Why do this work prior to the time they have made a success of digging that canal, if they ever do?

Mr. FREAR. I could not answer the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. One further question I wanted to ask. I did not get the other project of which the gentleman spoke.

Mr. FREAR. A 27-foot depth is proposed for the Hudson River up to, as I remember, Watervliet.

Mr. CALLAWAY. To the mouth of the canal?

Mr. FREAR. Practically to the mouth of the canal.

Mr. CALLAWAY. A depth of 27 feet when the canal has only a depth of 12 feet?

Mr. FREAR. I am suggesting that in reference to the survey.

Mr. PARKER of New York. I wanted to answer the question of the gentleman, but I will do it in my own time.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman finds fault with the proposition to have a survey at this time?

Mr. FREAR. That, practically, is in response to the chairman's statement that we are going to get out from under debt, whereas we are getting in deeper constantly and rapidly.

Mr. MOORE. I do not understand the gentleman to find fault with the work already done on the Hudson to connect that up with the canal?

Mr. FREAR. No; but just one word in reference to that. I talked with one man recently in the city of New York at the board of trade, in the presence of very responsible men, and he said to me substantially that he carried most of the freight on the Hudson River to-day on his boats. That is Mr. Kuykendahl. He further said there was sufficient depth for all purposes, and that the proposal to deepen the Hudson, as has been suggested, to this depth of 27 feet was, in his judgment, of no value.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman this: Why is this not a proper time to ask for a survey to obtain the information upon which the Board of Engineers and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors can act?

Mr. FREAR. In the judgment of the gentleman from Philadelphia, who favors all these appropriations, that would be his judgment, but with me it is different.

Mr. MOORE. If I were going to investigate the condition of the Hudson from Troy to Albany, I assure the gentleman I would not go to the steamship companies of New York to obtain my information. I would go along the Hudson River where the people are engaged in industries, who seek an outlet for their freight to the sea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, as most of my time has been used in questions by others, I would ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. I have agreed with the gentleman that, so far as the canal is concerned, the 12-foot improvement is right. So far as digging for the purposes of carrying great vessels through it, I think it is wrong to do so at this time. And it is for this reason: In almost every European country, take it in the case of Hamburg and in the case of Bremen, all these cities there have their lighters come up for 60 miles. I know that in the case of Philadelphia they have dredged a 35-foot channel way up to the city. Possibly we have been justified in it. It has been a question, though, whether or not that is of great benefit



to the public at large. It benefits some people, it is true. But here is a proposition to run 150 miles, I believe, and that is the case of the survey that is proposed, and it seems to me that we ought—

Mr. MOORE. I wanted the gentleman to take it from the viewpoint of Troy, Albany, and the great West, and the traffic that would come through the canal, rather than from the viewpoint of Hamburg. That is the gentleman's trouble.

Mr. FREAR. I understand. Troy has had these opportunities for all these years. The railroads have driven the Erie Canal out of the business of carrying, practically reducing the proportion from half of the traffic down to 2 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. Let them work again. That is the very point, namely, to get competition.

Mr. FREAR. If they work this project and not take the money out of the Treasury and work Uncle Sam, I have no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. COOPER. Would the gentleman convey the impression that the completing of the Erie Canal did nothing for the people of the country? Does not the gentleman know that it brought the price of carrying a bushel of wheat down from about 20 or 26 cents to 2 or 3 cents?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman makes an argument. I will say, yes; that it helped to do it. But when the railroads were built they put the canal out of operation. And the belief of the people there to-day, many of them, and people of good judgment, is that the same condition will result when \$150,000,000 is placed in the canal.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to answer first the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], who apparently is laboring under the impression that the barge canal is "to be" constructed. I wish to state that the question was submitted to a referendum, and it was voted by the people to bond the State for \$101,000,000; and then we submitted a second referendum that bonded the State for over \$30,000,000 for terminals. Now, of this work approximately 60 per cent has been completed.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You mean that 60 per cent of the making of that 12-foot channel from Buffalo to Albany has been completed?

Mr. PARKER of New York. I do; yes. I make that statement. Sixty per cent of the work has been completed for the barge canal. But still you must bear in mind that that takes in the Champlain Canal, too. That canal is about completed. But about 60 per cent of the entire work has been completed.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If they completed 60 per cent for \$101,000,000, why do you—

Mr. PARKER of New York. They will do it with the \$101,000,000; the \$101,000,000 was to complete the canal. The \$30,000,000 was for terminals at various places along the canal and along the Hudson River.

Now, to take up the question of the appropriation of \$1,500,000. You ask if this was to be extended to \$5,000,000. It is a completion, practically, of the \$5,000,000 which the United States Government must spend to make effective the expenditure of \$140,000,000 of our money.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How much has been expended there already by the Government?

Mr. PARKER of New York. I am unable to answer that question, but will answer the gentleman in this way, that it is nothing in comparison with what we ourselves have spent, not for the benefit of the people of the State of New York alone but for the benefit of the people of the West, who wished to send their produce through the canal which we built and which we paid for.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How much more, after this \$1,500,000, will be required to make the original estimate complete?

Mr. PARKER of New York. If I am not misinformed, this \$1,500,000 will practically complete what is called the Troy Dam, which must be put in to keep a uniform depth of water over the bars between Troy and Albany, and the channel will be deepened to a 12-foot channel down over the whole of the river.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Now, the thing I was most interested about was this survey provision on page 41—

Mr. PARKER of New York. I am going to take the survey up when I get through with the canal. I will take that up when I finish with the barge canal project.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am simply asking these questions for information.

Mr. PARKER of New York. If you will ask me the questions when I come to the subject, I will answer them with a great deal of pleasure, because I think I shall be able to do so. I am

addressing myself now to the question under discussion. I am perfectly willing to debate the million-and-a-half proposition with you.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am not debating. I am trying to find out.

Mr. PARKER of New York. This million and five hundred thousand dollars that we are asking is to make effective what is costing the State of New York about \$140,000,000. I do not say that we are doing it entirely in an altruistic manner, for we are not. We are doing it for the benefit of the commercial supremacy of New York City. We do not say that we are doing it all for you gentlemen in the West. Nevertheless, you will derive the benefits. You can not help it. On account of the Erie Canal you have had cheaper freight rates. If you should to-day fill up this canal which we are digging, your rates on all commodities that are grown in the West would immediately go up, and you know it. And we are willing to spend our money to get those rates down. Why question an appropriation of \$1,500,000 to the State of New York?

Now, about the survey. I wish to state that the survey is to ascertain this fact.

You know, of course, that one of the things that interfere with the efficiency of the barge canal is the tremendous dockage charges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PARKER of New York. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We are ready to vote now, I will say to the gentleman, and vote it in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New York. I wish to state that your dockage charges increase your freight rates to a tremendous extent. Now, the dockage in Troy and Albany are very much lower. This survey is for the purpose of ascertaining if the Hudson River can be deepened to a 27-foot channel at a reasonable expense, and therefore get the corresponding reduction in freight rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the largest items in the bill, and one of the most meritorious.

I just wanted to call attention to this fact that a few moments ago, when we were voting on the proposition of inserting new projects in the bill, which would undoubtedly have led to its defeat, on the Democratic side there were a number of gentlemen from the State of New York voting against the committee. Now I notice that there are only two gentlemen on the Democratic side of the aisle from the State of New York present when we are about to vote on this provision, of such importance to that State. I did not see how the New York delegation stood on the Republican side, but I now see only two.

Mr. MANN. If you had stayed on this side, where you belong, you would know how many there were on this side.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What was the gentleman's remark?

Mr. MANN. I say if the gentleman had stayed on this side, where he belonged, he would know how many there were. I regret to part with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On this occasion I disagree with my distinguished leader. I do not think that there is any politics in this bill. [Applause.] The gentleman is mistaken about that.

As I was about to say, only two Members of the New York delegation are present—my friend BROWN of New York and Mr. DRISCOLL, a distinguished member of the committee; both voted with the committee. But here is one of the largest items in the bill, and those gentlemen who were here a while ago and were so anxious to overthrow the committee and lead to the defeat of the bill are not here now to advocate their own item. [Laughter and applause.]

That is the kind of treatment we receive from certain of these distinguished gentlemen. They are very anxious that the committee shall take care of their projects, but they are not around to look after them themselves, but when there is an occasion to overthrow the committee you find them all here.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins let me ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent that the debate on the pending



paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has just criticized the New York Members for not being here to support this particular item in the bill, that Mr. PARKER of New York has just spoken in defense of this item, and Mr. CALDER and Mr. MOTT and a number of other gentlemen from New York are here, including Mr. PLATT, Judge DANFORTH, and—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not attempt to take away any credit from the gentleman. I saw the gentleman. I was speaking of gentlemen from New York on the Democratic side.

Mr. MOORE. There are more gentlemen here interested in this legislation than there are interested in the projects affecting the State of Washington. In fact, they have to be here, because the gentleman from the State of Washington alone is very well qualified to look after Washington matters. But he is now on the Democratic side, where he ought not to be, in view of the violent speech he made yesterday criticizing the President of the United States. [Laughter.] I call attention to the fact that Col. GOULDEN, of the twenty-third New York district, is present.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, I stepped out for a few moments and have missed a part of this interesting discussion.

Mr. MOORE. Yes. I will say of the gentleman from New York that I know of no more faithful or zealous Member on that side of the House. He did not leave the Chamber until after the Harlem River item was safely passed. [Laughter.] After he had seen that item go safely by, he retired for a brief moment, of course, to answer the call of a constituent. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will pardon an observation in regard to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], whom I know and like very well, I desire to apply this to him in explanation of his being on the Democratic side, that—

While the lamp holds out to burn  
The vilest sinner may return.

We welcome him to this side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, referring to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], let me remark that the reason why we accept the gentleman's presence so complacently to-day is that we took his speech yesterday as a joke. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I understand you are satisfied with him to-day, although yesterday you were not quite so fond. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has raised an interesting question with regard to channel depths. He objects to the introduction at this time of an item authorizing a survey for a deeper channel for the Hudson River. If ever there was a time when a survey should be asked for a deeper depth, it is at this time, because if the request were not made now a year's delay would result. The survey is the first step. The gentleman knows that a survey does not bind the committee or bind the House or bind the Engineers to the project, but is simply a request for data which the Engineers and the committee and the House must have before they can consider a project.

Now, with respect to the Hudson River, if they have not yet got a depth of 12 feet up to Albany and Troy, which they are trying to get through this appropriation, and they feel a necessity for a greater depth by reason of their great population and commerce, this is the time to ask for a survey for that increased depth. It is simply a matter of information, and does not involve a cent of expense except the cost of making the investigation.

As to the project itself, which the gentleman has criticized mildly, although he approves of the connection between the Great Lakes and the river and the ports of the Atlantic coast, it has come to my personal knowledge that within the last few months a vessel carrying passengers from Albany to Troy struck bottom three times on the way because there was only a 9-foot or less depth in the channel between the two great cities—cities with a great industrial output at the very center of communication between the Great Lakes on the west and the Atlantic Ocean on the east. And I wish to say—and I say it with some degree of shame, and it ought to shame the Government of the United States—that one of the small torpedo boats of the Government, upon which for a time was the Secretary of the Navy, went aground in front of Albany because there was not sufficient water for such a vessel of the Government to pass. Now, in the event of it ever being necessary—which it could not be now under our treaty relations—for the

Government to pass one of its smallest craft, either to carry supplies or munitions of war from the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes, if this channel condition prevailed, it could not get through to take advantage of the more than \$150,000,000 that the State of New York itself has already spent in providing a passageway from the West to the Atlantic Ocean in order to hold down the railroad rates and afford the very competition which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has not yet appreciated is the crux and the essence of the waterways agitation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendments will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Staten Island Sound, N. Y. and N. J.: Continuing improvement, \$500,000; for maintenance of improvement of Arthur Kill and the waters connecting Raritan Bay with New York Harbor, including channel north of Shooters Island, \$5,000; in all, \$505,000.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is seldom that I take up any time to make a speech before this body. I desire to say that I am to blame for the absence of the Members from the State of New York, as referred to by the gentleman from the State of Washington. They remained here for about 3 hours and 40 minutes, as they generally do, always attending to the business of the House. At my suggestion they went down to lunch, and I am to blame for their absence. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from the State of New York, I thought I had the right to advise my colleagues to go down to the restaurant.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is the gentleman responsible for the way they voted on the amendment awhile ago?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am not. I did my best to get my colleagues from the State of New York to vote with the committee, as I do not believe that the work of a committee is of much account in the House of Representatives if, after bringing in a report of procedure, the other Members of the House can not take the word and advice of the committee, especially in respect to new projects.

I do not claim that everything submitted by the committee to the House is in just exactly the form in which it ought to go to the country, but I do believe in a case like this, where men have been on the committee for 12, 14, 16, or 20 years, their judgment, after working on the bill for six weeks, is entitled to great credit and consideration.

This project for the improvement of the Hudson River, after the State of New York donated about \$150,000,000 for the Erie Canal improvement, should, in my judgment, receive the favorable vote of every Member of the House of Representatives. Only \$3,000,000 or thereabouts has been spent up to the present time by the United States Government on the Hudson River project. As the gentleman on the other side of the House stated, it will reduce freight rates. There is no question about that. Every man in this country knows that the river competition will reduce freight rates, and when a further depth is given to this improvement freight rates are bound to go down much lower than they are at the present time, because we will have competition with the railroads, and that must and will reduce freight rates.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. What does the gentleman think we are going to do about the freight rates, when the Interstate Commerce Commission is allowing the railroads a 5 per cent raise and the gentleman is asking us to spend millions of dollars to push the rates down?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I say that in competition with the water rates the rail freight rates must go down in that locality; and naturally, if they go down in that locality, it will be of great benefit to all parts of the country.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that if the rates go down in that locality, and the statement of the Interstate Commerce Commission is correct, that the railroads must have a higher rate generally in order to live, the railroads will have to raise their rates at interior points in order that the railroad companies can meet their losses at places where they have water competition?

Mr. DRISCOLL. In certain localities and under certain conditions I think the gentleman is right, but as a general proposition I think the gentleman is in error. I believe the reduction of freight rates that will be made by the completion of the Erie Canal will be of great benefit to the entire country.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If water competition cuts the rates down along the canals and rivers, the railroads must raise their freight rates at interior points to meet that deficit, as the In-



terstate Commerce Commission has just held in allowing a raise of 5 per cent. The people at interior points who are called upon to make these contributions will make their freight rates greater?

Mr. DRISCOLL. No; because the railroad goes to so many places which can not be reached by water. I am glad to see the New York Members returning from lunch.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Raritan Bay, N. J.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say with regard to this Hudson River item, over which there has been so much discussion, that I do not wholly agree with my colleague about the barge canal in New York State. I think the State of New York has been altogether too free in spending its money for the benefit of the rest of the country. I do not believe it ought to have built the barge canal with its own money, without any contribution from the United States Government. With regard to the Troy dam, the State of New York wanted to build it, and offered to build it, but the United States Government would not let the State of New York build it. That is why this item of \$1,500,000 is in the bill. The United States Government held it up last year, and it looks as though the whole barge canal might be held up by the failure to complete the Troy dam, which the United States Government would not let the State of New York build.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you mean that the United States Government would not let the State of New York contribute the money necessary to do that work, but insisted on doing the work itself in these hard times?

Mr. PLATT. I mean that the War Department would not allow the State of New York to build it, on the ground that it was in a navigable river, although the present dam was built by the State.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Newark Bay and Passaic River, N. J.: Continuing improvement, \$150,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out lines 16 and 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, strike out all of lines 16 and 17.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do this because of reasons based on the report of the engineer. We have expended upon the bay and river something like \$2,192,350. In October last there was on hand \$253,217. We are asked in this item to appropriate \$150,000 more. This is for a 20-foot project, and here is the engineer's report:

This improvement is necessary to the great industrial interests and has reduced freight rates, and its continuance is necessary to the successful carrying on of the business of this locality.

The point to which I wish to call attention particularly is that this improvement is necessary to the great industrial interests along the wharves. If that be true, if that be the function of government to look after special improvements, for special private interests as distinguished from the general public, then the case of Matawan Bay, which I criticized last year, ought to have been allowed, although the Senate struck it out. It was for the benefit of one fertilizing factory; and in the case of the Northeast River, for the benefit of three fertilizing factories. It is for the great industrial interests, and not for the people at large. There is no showing that it is necessary for commerce for the people of Newark, or that it will reduce their charges one cent, or that it will benefit anyone except the great industrial interests there located.

There is one phase of this question that occurs to me in this case. The Commissioner of Commerce, from whom I have quoted, showing the character of the surroundings of these harbors where they are owned by railroads, as I have shown, in this case presents an interesting state of facts. His report, volume 3, page 102, shows that the New Jersey Dock & Implement Co., incorporated in 1905, acquired the Hackensack Meadow Co., which owns 33,095 acres near Newark, and so forth.

This piece of land is at the junction of the two rivers directly opposite the city of Newark. This property is being benefited by the dredging of this channel. There is no contribution, and it seems if there could be any case requiring contribution from the riparian owner and from great industrial interests, it seems proper to ask for it in this case.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the industrial condition around Paterson, N. J., on the Passaic River?

Mr. FREAR. Only slightly.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman bases his amendment on the fact that it would benefit large interests?

Mr. FREAR. For the benefit of large industrial interests states the engineer.

Mr. MOORE. That is rather a harsh term around here just now, but the large interests referred to, I wish to inform the gentleman, is the great industrial center that takes in large quantities of raw material, fabricate them, and turn them out to the public in the form of the finished products, which go all over the United States. I call the gentleman's attention to the further interesting fact that where Paterson, with its great industrial interests, or, to use the phrase of the gentleman, "with large industrial interests," is taking on raw material from all centers of the country and sending out the finished product, that at times the mills are positively hampered in their work because it takes so long to transport the raw material to the mills 10 miles away, and if the river is open, then relief along that way would be obtained.

Mr. FREAR. Then they ought to make a contribution, and there would be no objection to it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be from the city of Newark. It is a city of 350,000 people. It has in it more different sorts of factories than any other town of the same size in the whole United States. When it was included in my district it had the largest production, both in amount and variety, of articles of any town in a single district. It is made up chiefly of people working in the various factories. I had the honor to introduce an amendment years ago for the survey of the Passaic River for a greater depth. It was then about 9 or 10 feet deep, and we are now to have 20 feet up to the city, because it has been found that the commerce, foreign and domestic, has increased by leaps and bounds. Instead of bringing simply limestone and cement blocks to Newark, as we used to do, and coal or grain, we now bring ores from Mexico and goods from all over the world. We have to bring the ships of great draft into the bay, and they now have to lighter to the wharves in the city of Newark. We have from 35,000 to 50,000 people working in the mills. It is for the benefit of the people there that they should have that commercial connection by water. It is for the reduction of freights on goods that come there. It is to enable the town to thrive and the country to thrive, because the country thrives when we have cheap materials going to the city of Newark and cheaper manufactures sent from that city.

I have only one other thing to say in respect to this, and that is with reference to that meadows improvement company. I did not know that there was an improvement company. I did know that years ago, when we had to lighter the mud out to sea upon our dredges it cost us some 40 cents a cubic yard, and I know that we made a remonstrance—and I was active in that—against granting any dredging contract at any such price; and it was finally discovered that the dredgers could buy salt meadow, which was worth in the market a very small amount, and that by pumping the mud on those salt meadows they were able to do the dredging for the United States Government at a small fraction of the original cost, so that we are really able to make our improvements in an economic way. I do not object to the fact that the men who do the dredging buy land in order that they may do the dredging work in the river at a cheaper cost to the Government. I believe that is good business. They might have put that mud on anyone else's land or on their own land, as they thought to their advantage. There is plenty of other land that they could put it on.

Something was suggested about local contributions to such work. The city of Newark has recently appropriated something over a million dollars in buying lands to establish at its own expense and dig a deep ship canal from the bay up to the city. Newark has expended quite an amount of this appropriation, and that fact has been brought forward in recent hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I understand that that committee was of the opinion that it was a most unusual thing—the energy and the earnestness with which the people of Newark had done their own share in trying to help the work of the United States Government and to encourage the commerce, which really redounds to the benefit of the United States. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.



The Clerk read as follows:

Monongahela River, Pa.: Completing the reconstruction of Lock and Dam No. 6, \$211,200.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 14 and 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, strike out all of lines 14 and 15.

[Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that there are Members of the House who are interested in this proposition. Here is a two hundred thousand dollar appropriation. We passed a New York appropriation. In fact, I did not move to strike out anything in New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. For which I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. And I did not do so because I thought most of those projects are justified. But in the case of the Monongahela River, I think I ought to present the statistics in order that we might know some of the facts, if time permits. There is a large traffic on that river, and I appreciate that fact. It is largely in the hands, as I understand, of one company, the Monongahela Coal & Coke Co., a company that also largely controls the coal output.

Mr. BARCHFELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman—

Mr. FREAR. In just one moment. This company owns, or did own and control, as I understand, some time ago some 60 different boats. It handles practically all of the coal that goes down that river and the coal that goes down the Ohio River. That brings me to the point of the traffic on the Ohio River about which I was criticized yesterday by the gentleman who sits at my left, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER]. He called attention of the House to the fact that in 1912 the engineer's report only showed 9 months of traffic, whereas in 1913 it showed 12 months, and he endeavored to draw a conclusion that from that I had misstated—I believe he thought unconsciously—the facts. Let us see, because it is very important to know if we understand the condition on the Ohio River. Is it alone those who live on the Ohio? Here are the statistics. In the engineer's report of 1913, page 981, in nine months the commerce was 8,618,369 tons. On page 1052 of the 1914 report in 1913 it appears that it was 9,814,123 tons, about a million tons increase. But the average in each case at the same rate makes a loss of 14 per cent. But let us go further. Take the statistics we can find on the Ohio River at the Ohio River and the Louisville & Portland Canal, and we find that the loss has been about 30 per cent in 10 years, counting open river and the canal, which includes coal, that makes up nine-tenths of the commerce. Take the Ohio River at the mouth—at Cairo. The only reports of the engineers that I have found show that 1,250,000 tons went out of there and down the river in 1907.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Just one moment. Before I pass from that, the claim that 8,000,000 tons goes down the Ohio is farcical when we learn that at the Portland Canal it is only a million tons, or a little over, that comes out of the river at Cairo. When it reaches New Orleans it is less than 900,000 tons, according to the same engineer's report. Apparently the continuous trip has been counted, as the chairman so well said, by adding together at different points, or quadrupling, as he said, the traffic. In that way the engineers have, as they say, duplicated commerce reports, but even if that be true, here is the engineer's statement itself that shows the comparative loss.

Mr. BARCHFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] regarding this appropriation for \$211,000 for the Monongahela River. He said that the commerce on that river is absolutely in the hands of one company—

Mr. FREAR. I said, largely.

Mr. BARCHFELD (continuing). The Monongahela Coal Co.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. What is the difference if it is?

Mr. BARCHFELD. Why, it would be a crime, according to the gentleman's idea, if the commerce of that river were in the control of one company. I do not belong to that class of economists who criticize and are ready to crucify people because they are doing something for the people for the benefit of mankind. This stream, the Monongahela River, canalized from Pittsburgh to Morgantown, W. Va., a distance of 115 miles, has 17 locks and dams and is a living example of what canalization can do for streams. That small stream carried last year 15,000,000 tons of commerce, not the property of one concern, but the property of two dozen concerns doing business at Pittsburgh. That is why Pittsburgh is the hub of industry of the United

States and the largest manufacturing and industrial city in the world. Pittsburgh needs the improvement of this Lock No. 6 on the Monongahela to get her ready for a greater and a broader prosperity that confronts that great city. I want to inform the gentleman who comes from Wisconsin that in my community we know what cheap transportation means along water routes. We have the cheapest water transportation on this planet in the Pittsburgh district. To-day we are bringing coal from the mine to the furnace, a distance of 50 to 60 miles, at the ridiculous freight rate of 5 cents a ton, only made possible because this stream is navigable 10½ months in the year. [Applause.]

When this stream is closed by ice and we have our spring and fall freshets six weeks is taken away from that city in the advantage obtained by water transportation. Then we are compelled to go to the railroads to bring the coal from the mines to the furnaces in order that our men may have an opportunity to labor in the mills, which we do not consider a crime. Then we are compelled to pay 62 cents for every ton of coal that comes from the mine to the furnace. [Applause.] My colleague from Wisconsin should live in that city, which does things. My own county mines one-fourth of all the bituminous coal mined in the United States. We are taking out in western Pennsylvania 30,000,000 tons annually. We produce one-half of the coke of the United States in that community. We are the greatest manufacturing center on earth, and it is water transportation that has made Pittsburgh great, and as an evidence to our competitors in the future greatness of that great industrial city we are ready and anxious and willing by our own funds, raised by our own people, to construct the Lake Erie & Ohio River Ship Canal, at a cost of \$60,000,000, to make it possible for Pittsburgh to maintain the mighty prestige that she holds at this hour in order to bring the ore from the mines in Minnesota and Michigan, and also in the gentleman's own State of Wisconsin, to the great, big manufacturing center located at the headwaters of the Ohio at the junction of the Allegheny and the Monongahela, and we in turn transport our coal, making it possible for the people in that section to weather the storms of winter; we, in order to maintain our mighty prestige, are ready to build that canal so that we can reduce the freight rates from the Lakes to the manufacturing plant and in turn give those people cheap fuel.

I will inform the gentleman what this expenditure of \$211,200 means. It is a little over one-third of the actual cost of the locks, it is for modernizing these locks according to modern ideas, and we propose to send through these locks steel barges 200 feet long, 20 feet wide, and having a draft of 9 feet, each vessel carrying 1,000 tons of coal. We propose to be in a position to deliver that coal from the mine to the people of New Orleans—in spite of the prediction that there are less than 900,000 tons that pass Cairo to New Orleans—we propose to carry that coal from western Pennsylvania down to New Orleans, a distance of 2,167 miles, for the ridiculous figure of 60 cents a ton. [Applause.] To-day we have a cheaper rate from Pittsburgh to New Orleans by rail than they have from Birmingham, Ala., to New Orleans by rail, only made possible because the great and mighty Ohio, La Belle Rivière, the beautiful river, named by the French over a century ago, is a competitor with the railroad. We in western Pennsylvania believe in the improvement of our streams. We believe in cheap transportation by water, and I want to say to my friend that when the Panama Canal is completed—and our Government is spending millions of dollars in order to be in a position to furnish coal to the fleets of the world—we expect to furnish the coal from the Pittsburgh district that will carry the commerce from the Occident to the Orient and from one end of this planet to the other through the Panama Canal. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the committee for taking up their time at this time in order to answer any argument that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] might make against this river and harbor bill. I think the argument that he makes is not on the merits of this bill at all, but simply to give him some notoriety in the papers, which seems to be fascinating to him, because the newspapers have taken it up and in that way have given him, as he thinks, a great boost as a great Member of Congress. And I want to say that the argument that he used—

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I will call the gentleman to order only for the purpose that I may be privileged to answer him. He is not talking about the matter under consideration. I have not indulged in any personalities, and I would ask unanimous consent for five minutes in order that I might answer the gentleman.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has the floor now.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going to get permission, I would like to have at least three minutes to answer what the gentleman from Wisconsin said—

Mr. FREAR. I have not been attacking the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia will proceed.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. If the statement was true that freight on the Ohio River has been reduced in late years, it is easy to account for that. There are now several months in the year that freight can not be carried by water on account of the low stage of the river. When this river is improved, then suitable boats will be provided and the volume of traffic will greatly increase, because freight can be carried for 25 per cent of what it now costs.

The shippers patronize the railroads now, because they can use them every day in the year. When this improvement is finished the advantages will be shown as clearly as the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARCHFELD].

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I am not entitled to the floor, and I have been held very strictly to the text by the Chairman. I wish to say this, that the gentleman's charge that I appealed to the newspapers may be true. [Applause.] I realize this, Mr. Chairman, that no man on this floor can raise his voice so as to be heard outside. It must come from the press, and the press of this land is the agent that killed the last river and harbor bill by exposing the conditions contained in that bill and calling attention to the fight in the Senate, where the bill was finally defeated. We were only too glad to ask for the aid of that agency. When the bill went to the Senate men who knew more about these facts than I do, by far, took the same projects, exposed the worthlessness of many of them, and on the strength of their action, aided materially by the press, the bill was defeated. True, we ought to get light fixed upon the bill, but it was not for personal reasons. The gentleman imputes that. That, of course, is his privilege. But without the aid of the press, I believe that bill of \$53,000,000 could not have been defeated. As it was due to that help, you have the results before you. A bill was placed in this House; not a single amendment could be added, not a single item could be struck out, nor can they be struck out to-day from this bill, no matter what facts are presented. A committee of 21 members holds this House in its hands, and it always will under the present system.

Mr. MURRAY. That is socialistic talk.

Mr. FREAR. I do not know what the gentleman speaks of. Oklahoma has had its socialists. They have been known throughout the country, some of them reliable and some of them estimable men. I felt that when a personal attack is made—I do not know whether the gentleman meant it so or not—I should reply to it, but I do not wish to resent it in a personal way. I want you to know that we did appeal in every fair way to the journals of the country for their aid, and it was given in no uncertain way.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It is a very rare thing that any Member of Congress ever tries to get into the newspapers, is it not?

Mr. FREAR. I thank the House for the courtesy of listening.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FREAR. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time to yield.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Following up the rates on the Ohio River, you put some figures in the RECORD showing that the rates had been increased on the Ohio River since 1906?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Just allow me to ask this single question. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have not been given a minute to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] will proceed.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, laboring under an exaggerated ego, believes that he and

the newspapers of this country killed the river and harbor bill in the last session of Congress. I can not see it in that way. When the last river and harbor bill was passed by the House, in the month of March, 1914, I was up in Michigan helping to investigate the copper strike; but at that time, if I recollect rightly, we had over \$100,000,000 in the Treasury, plenty of money on hand, and, while I had my misgivings about it, we were assured by the gentlemen who were proponents of the Underwood tariff bill, that had become a law, that this condition would continue; and the Rivers and Harbors Committee, acting under conditions that then existed, took on the projects that went out at this session, for instance, like the Connecticut projects and others. Things went on, and I have no doubt that the bill would have been passed by the Senate, but on the 4th day of last September the President of the United States appeared here in person and notified us that there was a decline in our customs receipts and that we would soon be confronted by a serious condition in our national revenues; and from that moment the rivers and harbors bill was killed as dead as a doornail, but not by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin undertake to make me believe that the great newspapers of this country influenced the Senator from my State in fighting the rivers and harbors bill? Does he intend to lead this House to believe that it was the newspapers of this country that influenced the Senate in killing the rivers and harbors bill that we had passed through this House and for which they finally substituted a lump-sum appropriation? Does he for a moment think that it was his work or the work of the newspapers? Why, it was nothing more than the great falling off in our revenues and the filibuster carried on in the Senate. And the gentlemen, the leaders of the majority in this Congress, seeing there had to be retrenchments somewhere, and all the appropriation bills having been passed, and the rivers and harbors bill being the only appropriation bill remaining, they visited their entire retrenchment on the rivers and harbors bill.

Now, the gentleman says that I have been erroneous in quoting the figures representing the annual tonnage of the Ohio River. I thought I made it clear yesterday when I spoke of the tonnage on the Ohio River and stated that prior to April 1, 1912, the statistics are unreliable, and that the engineering bodies in investigating those figures for 1905, when the statistics showed that there was a tonnage of 13,000,000 tons, found that there was only a 9,000,000-ton traffic, and they said that the traffic up to that time was 9,000,000 tons annually. The same method was pursued up to April 1, 1912. Since that time, under the improved method of taking the statistics of the commerce on the Ohio, the tonnage has run more than 9,000,000 tons a year. It has run to 10,000,000, and I am satisfied in the year 1912 it was at least 12,000,000 tons.

The gentleman says that this tonnage that comes out of the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers and down the Ohio, this nine or ten million tonnage, does not go entirely down the river. Why, is the tonnage of any harbor or bay or any stream computed or estimated by counting only the tons that traverse the entire length of the river or that go across the length of the bay? Why, no. Have we not the right to compute every ton in making the estimates on the Ohio River—every ton that floats on the river, whether it goes 10 miles or a hundred miles or a thousand miles? It seems the gentleman's criticism is folly and his position is untenable. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the Chair understand that the debate under the five-minute rule must be confined to the subject matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. And there can be only two talks—one for and one against? Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right as to each amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. Then I want to give notice, Mr. Chairman, that I am going to object hereafter, and shall ask that the rule be carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ice harbor at Marcus Hook, Pa.: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, we have just passed the Delaware River item. A question of navigation has arisen with respect to the upper Delaware River. It affects the shipment of



coal and the ability of the Navy colliers to use the river. I have already spoken on this question, but there is some additional information and correspondence which I should like to extend in the Record. I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject named. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Broadkill River, Del.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE offers the following amendment: Page 10, between lines 7 and 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Improving inland waterways from the Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland, by the purchase of the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and appurtenant property, in accordance with the project recommended by the Chief of Engineers in paragraph 3 of his report dated August 9, 1913, and published in House document 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$2,250,000; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to purchase said canal and appurtenant property at a cost not to exceed the amount herein appropriated for such purpose."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal project, which was discussed on the floor of the House very fully last year. It was included in the last river and harbor appropriation bill. It went to the Senate and met the fate of other provisions which went out as a result of the filibuster. It seems to me it is proper to offer it again at this time. I do not expect to discuss it at length now, but I shall ask for a vote upon it, and pending that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. May I ask whether this section of the inland waterways canal has ever been previously provided for by Congress?

Mr. MOORE. It has been the subject of two or three favorable reports by the United States Army engineers.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am asking the gentleman whether there was a provision for this section of the inland waterways system in the House bill of last year? I want to get it straight in my own mind.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; it was provided for in the House bill at another figure, which was raised in the Senate. I have taken the Senate figures in the amendment which I offer now.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is it a part of the general proposed system from Boston to the Rio Grande?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, so far as the Atlantic coastal part of it is concerned; but it stands on its own bottom, because it happens to be what most of us on the Atlantic coast regard as the most important link in the chain, not only for commercial purposes but also for the purposes of national defense.

Mr. DUPRÉ. From the standpoint of Congress and the War Department, is not each project in this chain of inland waterways a proposition which stands on its own bottom?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and each one can be legislated on as a separate provision.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And that has been done in the past.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and very properly so, because no advocate of this Atlantic waterways chain contemplates for a moment appropriations covering the entire project at any one time. The only sensible way to proceed with work of this kind is to proceed link by link, and that is the manner in which it is being done. I am glad the gentleman put that proposition up to me, because it enables me to say that very many Members who discuss this project, and who have the idea that it is going to deplete the Treasury, simply do not understand the method of procedure. It is not unreasonable.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The reason why I ask the gentleman the question is because he and I and other Members are being denounced by certain gentlemen from the southern section of this country for not regarding each link in this canal as one part of a grand whole which Congress ought to provide for all at once.

Mr. MOORE. I shall use whatever time remains to me to take up the thought expressed by the gentleman from Louisiana. What we need in this country more than anything else, and what the Rivers and Harbors Committee needs, in my judgment, more than anything else, is a comprehensive plan of development, and that is what we lack. There is no general system for developing the waterways of this country. We are

told by gentlemen who presume to be scientific on this waterway question that we ought to have a comprehensive and scientific plan. When we propose such a thing, when we show how nature itself has pointed the way for the connecting up of the waterways, so that there may be one continuous procession, to be acquired at reasonable expense, then they say to us, "It is too big to contemplate." If in a time like this these gentlemen will simply bear in mind what is actually going on in Europe, where every country engaged in war is utilizing every waterway it has, and every waterway is completed and improved to perfection and indispensable for the purposes of commerce and the transportation of supplies and the movement of vessels, they will understand what some of us are driving at in trying to get some comprehensive plan worked into the river and harbor appropriation bill.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; because I think the gentleman from Texas is one of those gentlemen who do not yet comprehend the system.

Mr. CALLAWAY. My comprehension of the inland waterway system is that it is to run from the mouth of the Rio Grande to Boston; that that is the comprehensive scheme when it is ultimately completed.

Mr. MOORE. I am only speaking for the system along the Atlantic coast; the gentleman has not got that yet. But if the gentleman were to ask me whether in the course of time, in view of the increasing population, in view of the development of commerce, it should extend along the Gulf, up the Mississippi, to the Great Lakes, I should say yes; but that, of course, would be too expensive to undertake now or at once. Any man in Congress or out would be a fool to think we could at this time appropriate enough money for such a great scheme as that. But if you have a populous section, great business, and opportunity for greater development, then it would also be foolish to say that we should not apply a portion of our money to the improvement of such a waterway factor, providing for the national defense and developing the commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] asks that the time of his colleague be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that there is now a waterway from the Rio Grande, by the Gulf of Mexico, to Boston?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; on the Gulf and the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And you are going to dig a canal to furnish an inland way?

Mr. MOORE. Certainly, because it is absolutely necessary for the protection of life and property and the promotion of commerce.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is not that a good deal like the old lady that cut a big hole in the door for the big cats and a little hole for the little cats?

Mr. MOORE. There have been some gentlemen, in times past, that have built harbors of refuge in the sand, and the ocean has swept in and closed them up. That may be likened to Mrs. Partington sweeping back the waves with her broom. The gentleman from Texas wants to get away from the high-tops of Texas and come along the seaboard and see the waste and destruction of property. There is a lumber-laden vessel from the South lying now on the shoals of Barnegat that need not have been there if we had had this inland waterway. Now, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] for asking for an extension of time for me, because this may be the last time in this House that I shall have an opportunity in the discussion of this matter to pay him tribute for his courtesy and the good work that he has done on the river and harbor committee.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania know that there is an inland waterway canal system in the State of Texas?

Mr. MOORE. I do.



Mr. DUPRÉ. And that there is a great demand that it shall be extended?

Mr. MOORE. I do; and I know that there are some streams that might be cut through and an interchange of commerce made, but the gentleman from Texas does not yet understand it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does the gentleman understand that this system will never develop its largest possibilities until the canal is cut through the State of Louisiana to the Mississippi River and the city of New Orleans?

Mr. MOORE. That may be. Louisiana ought to be taken care of, because Louisiana has suffered at the hands of its friends more than any other State in the Union, and if it had not been for the courage and ability of her Representatives here I do not know but that she would have been sunk in the bottom of the sea. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] is one of the men that I like to talk to, and if he wants to know about the splendid waterway that we have outside on the ocean, I will tell him again what I have stated here several times. During the period between 1900 and 1910 we lost \$40,000,000 in property by taking this open course. We lost 2,200 lives by taking this open course. We had 5,700 disasters in ships by taking this open course, and I think in order to save much of that life and property it would have paid to spend the \$40,000,000 lost in 10 years in opening an inside waterway where trade and commerce might have floated easily and safely, and where human lives might not have been subjected to so great a risk. I will tell the gentleman another thing about this 13-mile canal that I am talking about now. During the Civil War—

Mr. CALLAWAY. Oh, let me ask the gentleman a question about the matter that we have just gone over.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, that is too far back.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do not talk interminably. Heavens and earth—

Mr. MOORE. Do not go back so far. During the Civil War that I am talking about [laughter] this little canal was the means practically of saving the Union.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Well, thank Heaven that the Union is saved, but let it go at that.

Mr. MOORE. If it is saved, let us spend a little more money on it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is the gentleman arguing to anybody in this country that any ships are going to go through that inland waterway?

Mr. MOORE. Why, yes. Has the gentleman been up to Cape Cod lately, or is he so devoted to the sand hills in his own country that he will not go? If he will go there, he will find a private enterprise has opened up a canal 8 miles long, and that his own Secretary of the Navy, who is a peace-loving man, has been sending torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers through that canal, and is raising his hands on high and saying, "Thank God for the private enterprise that put this cut through this sand bar, so that we do not have to send these boats out to sea and have them injured or any lives lost." Why, do you know several years ago I tried to get the department to send a few of these boats through the canal that I am speaking of now—the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal—and they wrote back that they could not do it because there was not sufficient depth of water? Then they sent them outside from the Philadelphia Navy Yard down to the gentleman's own section of the country, and they went ashore outside of Cape Hatteras, and the property of the Government was damaged and the lives of men were endangered. Some day, even down yonder in Texas, away back in the hills, up in the country the gentleman so ably represents, he may discover that in order to protect the life of the Nation it would have been wise to spend some of the income that comes through our own ports to provide these very means of communication. This little canal and others like it were the means during the Civil War of protecting the whole coast line, and just now we would do well to prepare ourselves to protect it again. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have been very greatly interested at different times reading the reports of the engineers in reference to the proposed inland waterway from Boston to the coast and along the coast to Texas. It seems to me, however, that the gentlemen who are proposing the scheme do not go quite far enough. I live in a city which is on the western edge of the Great Lakes system. We have water communication from there to the Atlantic Ocean. It would be a great saving in freight rates, and it would be a great saving in lives now lost on the railroads because of wrecks if we were to build a canal from Chicago to San Francisco over the Rocky Mountains [laughter], and it is quite possible to do this, because there are places in the mountains where there is a sufficient and ample supply of water to operate the canal. We could re-

duce freight rates across the continent probably 50 per cent, and we could save all of the wrecks that now occur upon the railroads, destroying life, and could carry the freight and passengers safely and economically by this waterway across the continent. I hope that the gentlemen who wish to deplete the Treasury for an inland waterway along the Atlantic Ocean, where they now have cheap freight rates and easy water connection, will join with us so that we will make a proper loot of the Treasury. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. May I at this point move to strike out the last word, or is all time exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired under the agreement. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE offers the following amendment: Page 10, between lines 7 and 8, insert new paragraphs as follows:

"Improving inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland, by the purchase of the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and appurtenant property, in accordance with the project recommended by the Chief of Engineers in paragraph 3 of his report dated August 9, 1913, as published in House Document No. 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$2,250,000. And the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase, at a cost not to exceed \$2,250,000, the said canal and its appurtenances. And the said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for consummating said purchase, the same to be paid on the warrant of the Secretary of War upon full and absolute conveyance to the United States of the said canal and its appurtenances.

"In the event of the inability of the Secretary of War to make voluntary purchase of said canal and its appurtenances for said sum of \$2,250,000, or any less sum fixed by him, then the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to institute and carry to completion proceedings for the condemnation of said canal and its appurtenances. Such condemnation proceedings shall be instituted and conducted in, and jurisdiction of said proceedings is hereby given to, the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

"The sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the necessary costs of said condemnation proceedings; and upon final award or judgment therein the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to draw his warrant on the Treasury for the amount of said judgment and costs, and said amount for the payment thereof is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. When said canal and appurtenances shall have been acquired by the United States, whether by purchase or condemnation, the Secretary of War shall take charge thereof and operate, manage, and control the same, under such rules and regulations as he shall from time to time prescribe, with a view to its ultimate improvement and operation as recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

"The proceedings for condemnation aforesaid shall be substantially as follows:

"The Secretary of War, in the name of the United States, may apply to the district judge of the United States for the district of Delaware, first giving the president of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. at least five days' notice, in writing, of the intended application, and the said district judge shall appoint five judicious and impartial persons to view the premises and assess the damages which the owner or owners will sustain by reason of the taking thereof. The said persons shall be sworn or affirmed before some judge, justice of the peace, or notary public, before entering on the premises, faithfully and impartially to perform the duties assigned them. They shall give 10 days' notice, in writing, to the president of the corporation owning the premises of the time of their meeting to view the premises; and the said commissioners shall certify their finding and award to both parties, but if either party is dissatisfied with the damages so assessed, such party may, on application to the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware, within 30 days after such assessment, sue out a writ of ad quod damnum, requiring the United States marshal for said district, in the usual form, to inquire of 12 impartial men of his district of the damages as aforesaid, and their report shall be final; the said commissioners shall assess the least actual cash value of the canal and its appurtenances, and the United States, upon paying the damages so assessed, shall become entitled to have, hold, use, and enjoy the canal and its appurtenances forever. And in case the owner of said canal and appurtenances shall be incapable of receiving, or unwilling, or neglect to receive said damages, or call upon the United States for the same, the United States may deposit the amount of said damages to the credit of such owner in the Farmers' Bank of the State of Delaware, at Wilmington, Del., subject to its order, whereupon the United States shall be entitled to have, hold, use, and enjoy the said canal and appurtenances forever. The expenses of the assessment by the said commissioners of the damages aforesaid and all costs incurred in the execution of the writ of ad quod damnum shall be paid by the United States."

Mr. MANN. On that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, my main purpose in introducing this amendment is to follow up the other, so as to obtain the advantage of at least that time which will elapse between now and the passage of another river and harbor appropriation bill. This is one of the things we have to prepare for in advance, and I am hoping and expecting, as I think all of the friends of this project are, that ultimately the River and Harbor Committee, in view of other approved projects with which this links up, will accept it. The adoption of the amendment would place the project in that position where proper court proceedings could be



had with a view of ascertaining the value of the property to be taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How many miles of this canal are there that are proposed to be bought under this resolution?

Mr. MOORE. Thirteen miles.

Mr. MADDEN. How wide is it?

Mr. MOORE. Twenty-four feet at the locks.

Mr. MADDEN. How deep is it?

Mr. MOORE. Ten feet.

Mr. MADDEN. What kind of traffic can go on a canal 20 feet wide?

Mr. MOORE. About a million tons of commerce go through the canal every year which pays tolls substantially equivalent to railroad rates. There is an advantage in shipping bulk by boat and having it move more expeditiously than it would if it were shipped by rail. I explained briefly, in answer to the questions of the gentleman from Texas a little while ago, some of the advantages of this canal, and under leave to print, which I understand has been granted, I shall explain it more fully later on; but in passing I desire to say that in the distribution of our favors in this House—referring to the gentleman from Texas and others; yes, and to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was upon the Democratic side and out of place a little while ago—that I believe we should not forget to pay our respects even to our party leaders. Now, there is no man in the House who has a higher personal regard for the leaders of the House—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. I was speaking of leaders and am glad to place the gentleman in that category. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking the gentleman if he will yield for a question.

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman as one of the leaders of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I do not care in what capacity the gentleman yields, but I want to know why the present owners of this canal want to sell it.

Mr. MOORE. They have expressed no desire to sell it. The great difficulty from beginning to end has been to get any information or proposition from them. The canal is a paying canal, and they do not want to get rid of it. There has been no movement of any kind in the interest of the company to sell the canal, none whatever, so far as I know. I am glad the gentleman puts the question so pointedly, because it can be answered with directness.

As I said, in the distribution of our favors in this House we ought not to omit our friends. I am an admirer of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and there are reasons why I like all the members of that committee. Some of them oppose projects that I believe worthy, and we fight that out; but I am amazed that my own leader, the gentleman from Illinois, whom I respect as much as I do any man in this House, should rise and oppose a suggestion so wholly meritorious. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggests inferentially what the gentleman from Texas suggested, that this coastal project is a great big expensive and possibly a chimerical scheme, which ought not to be pressed while we have the broad bosom of the Atlantic on which to come and go. I think I can understand why the gentleman from Illinois takes that ground. He comes from out yonder in the Middle West, and his heart is loyal to his surroundings. He believes that all things tend toward the West, and that ultimately the Pacific coast will be the scene of all our activities.

Well, there are those of us along the Atlantic seaboard who started there and whose forefathers started there before us. From the beginning of the country we have contributed to the western trend. We are willing to admit that most good things went out of the East before they passed to the West. Some of them lodged in Chicago, and there some of them remained. But the gentleman from Illinois has his eye to the westward. I do not accuse him of doing that which is being done in another Chamber, where some of our friends are at play in a presidential game, but I do believe that the gentleman from Illinois, much as I admire and readily as I follow him, would make the mistake of his life if in any platform of his he should put a plank that would provide for a transcontinental canal from Chicago across the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. [Laughter and applause.] It would be a dream, and as a vote producer would not succeed. Admiring the gentleman from Chicago as I do, I hope he, too, will come down from the interior and join hands with the people along the coast line where the great population is, where the great industries are, and where the

constant trend of commerce arising in the East must flow on to the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that the gentleman from Philadelphia thought I was opposing his proposition a while ago. I was endeavoring to make a speech on behalf of it by offering a trade.

Of course the gentleman from Philadelphia, who never was in the country west of Washington, knows nothing about the West. In an official capacity I have been required to come East, so I know both parts of the country. The gentleman from Philadelphia, of course, believes that all the great works and the great men come from along the Atlantic Ocean; and that may be true. And yet those of us who come from the far West, who have constantly paid the taxes which have been spent along the Atlantic Ocean, believe that when we construct a new Atlantic Ocean just inside the shore line we ought to join with it a really valuable canal, which would be of some real benefit, so as to connect Chicago with the Pacific Ocean, it now being connected with the Atlantic Ocean. I hope the gentleman will join with us in this great undertaking, of equal merit with his.

Mr. MOORE. I would on the basis of appropriations already granted, if the gentleman would.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has suggested that the population is along this coast. I would like to make the observation that the center of population is about 75 miles from the home of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Philadelphia will never understand that.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. MOORE. I will say to the gentleman that I have been West, as far west as the Pacific coast. The latest census statistics justify the statement that fully one-third of the population of the country is still east of the Appalachian chain, and that is more than 30,000,000 people. Notwithstanding the trend of waterways appropriations is west, we are doing business in our congested area on one-quarter of the railroad mileage of this country. And while we have two or three railroads to come and go on in the city of Philadelphia and only one system in a city like Boston, the gentleman from Chicago, very largely at the expense of the investor in the East, has 15 or 20 trunk lines running to and from his city.

Mr. MANN. That is the reason we have the trunk lines. That is where the business is. If we had not the business we would not have the railroads.

I make the point of order against the amendment, Mr. Chairman. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has conferred upon it the jurisdiction in reference to the improvement of rivers and harbors. That is paragraph 8 of Rule XI. The matters are referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, as follows:

To the improvements of rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Paragraph 56 of Rule XI:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, viz: • • • The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

There is a committee of this House which has jurisdiction of canals, and that is not the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It has been held by chairmen in the past that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors did not have jurisdiction of bills providing for the construction of canals, and under the rule giving the committee privilege, this bill being a privileged bill, it would not be in order, even if they had jurisdiction over the subject matter, to offer an amendment in reference to the construction or the purchase of canals, because the only privilege they have is in regard to the improvement of rivers and harbors. The gentleman's amendment shows that his proposition relates neither to a river nor a harbor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] on the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I am going to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. It is a very important point of order. He is chairman of the committee and has made a study of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree that the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois is well taken. In fact, similar questions have been passed upon by the various chairmen who have presided over the Committee of the Whole when the various river and harbor bills have been before us in days gone by. I concede that wherever a canal is



being constructed, a canal pure and simple, the River and Harbor Committee has no jurisdiction of the work, but wherever the purpose of a canal is to connect waters through which boats may go from navigable waters, a river or a harbor, for instance, into other navigable waters, whether a river or a harbor, the River and Harbor Committee has jurisdiction of the proposed improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman any authority on that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not anticipate this question would arise to-day, and have no authorities at hand. However, some years ago—I think it was when the bill of 1905 was before the House; it may have been the one of 1902—a similar question was raised here, and I am under the impression that the gentleman from Illinois at that time agreed to the proposition I am now laying down, although I would not say positively, but I am under the impression he did. I know I took part in the discussion at the time. It was this kind of a question: A survey, I believe, was proposed for the purpose of constructing a canal from the waters of St. George Sound across the intervening piece of land out into the Gulf of Mexico.

The point of order was then raised upon it by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Keifer] who was trying to get a similar proposition before the House for surveys in that State.

Mr. MANN. Where a point of order had been sustained against his proposition, which was on all fours with this.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; the point of order at that time was overruled.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the provision for the survey was permitted to remain in the bill, notwithstanding the fact that a similar point of order was made against it. It was nothing but a provision for a survey, as I recall.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Was not one of the points made at that time that the canalization was taken over for the purpose of continuing a waterway, as in this instance?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was for the purpose of continuing a natural waterway, but in a sense it was a canal.

Mr. MOORE. Here were two bodies of water, both improved, and the proposition was that they should be connected by another body of water, which happened to be in the form of a canal.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid my recollection is a little better than that of my friend from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. On the occasion to which he refers Gen. Keifer, of Ohio, either had in the river and harbor bill or offered as an amendment, I do not remember which, a proposition for a canal in Ohio from one point to another, a proposition exactly like this. I made the point of order that the committee had no jurisdiction, and the Chair sustained the point of order. Subsequently in the bill there was a provision with reference to the improvement that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] speaks of, and Gen. Keifer made a point of order on that. It was a question of fact, of course, and on the statement of the chairman of the committee that it was not a canal, but was an improvement of an existing waterway, which had been constructed under the authority to improve rivers and harbors, the Chair overruled that point of order. I helped to sustain the Chair in that attitude, it being a question of fact; but that Chairman held, in the ruling on Gen. Keifer's proposition, that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors did not have jurisdiction over canals.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the discussion as to the point of order. There was some discussion of it in the committee last year. But I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that canals have been taken over, as, for instance, the Hennepin Canal. As to whether points of order were raised with respect to them I do not know.

I also call the attention of the Chair to the fact that in this instance there are two bodies of water, both subject to improvement and being improved by the Government, and that this proposition is to take over an existing waterway to connect these two existing bodies of water, the connecting link being at the present time an artificial waterway called a canal.

The taking over of the canal would simply mean the continuation of the work on either side of it. It would mean that that which has already been provided for on both sides of the existing stream would be connected up. That is a physical condition which I assume the Chair ought to consider before he decides a question of this importance.

I wish again to say to the Chair that I think if a little time be given it could easily be shown to the Chair that several existing canals have already been taken over and that no objection

has been raised. I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will bear me out in the statement that there have been several instances of this kind, and that if there should be an unfavorable ruling on this point it would very seriously affect many other improvements throughout the country which are now in contemplation, and some of which are actually under way.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. May I suggest to the Chair, with the consent of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that he reserve his decision on the point of order until our session to-morrow? That would enable us to proceed, and perhaps it would be more agreeable to the Chair.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that connection, would not the same proposition come up when a point of order is made to the next paragraph, providing for the condemnation of a railroad bridge?

Mr. SMALL. I think not. That is work already in progress. That has heretofore been adopted. It is not a new project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will say that if the position of the gentleman from Illinois obtains, the Rivers and Harbors Committee could recommend no work that would connect one navigable waterway with another. All work of that class would have to go to the Committee on Railways and Canals. We could not deal with waterways at all unless they were navigable waters throughout.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he will be perfectly willing to reserve his decision until to-morrow. There are ample decisions on the question. It is only a determination of the question whether this canal is in fact a canal. If it is, the Chair thinks, under the decisions which he has before him, that the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Chair will pardon me, I do not think that alone settles the question. Where a canal is for the purpose of connecting one body of navigable water with another body of navigable water with a view to having free intercourse between the two bodies of water, so that water craft, for instance, starting in one can run the artificial waterway to another, I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction—

Mr. MOORE. Which connecting body of water is itself navigable.

Mr. MANN. It is not a difficult proposition. We have a Committee on Railways and Canals. A while ago some one referred to the project of joining the Great Lakes with the Ohio River at Pittsburgh. The proposition has been before this House at various times authorizing the construction of a canal from Lake Erie to Pittsburgh, and that is work that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors never had any jurisdiction over. It has gone to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The only proposition of that kind that I know about went to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where it was investigated.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is badly deficient in knowledge, then, because we have had here several bills reported from the Committee on Railways and Canals. We reported one once or twice from the Committee on Railways and Canals while my friend from Florida was probably thinking about some improvement in Florida.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know that the Committee on Railways and Canals has jurisdiction of some of those propositions, but I do know that the most of them have come before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that committee has passed upon them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair realizes that the question is an important one, and he will reserve his decision until to-morrow, by unanimous consent, if there is no objection.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection. There is not any question but that the Chair will have to decide it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that after reserving his decision until to-morrow he will probably decide against it.

Mr. MANN. We have had this question up before at least five Chairmen, and they have always decided one way.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the Chair reserves his decision until to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others can submit what authorities they please.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent, then, to withdraw the amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment to this section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to acknowledge the graceful tribute paid me by my colleague, Mr. MOORE, as to my humble services on this committee. I am sorry that it comes rather late to be of use to me. [Laughter.] I am inclined to believe that it springs from sympathy because of my "lame" condition. I am sure, however, that it is well intended and I appreciate it as such. I want to say at this time a word or two as to what has been done since I have been on the committee for certain projects to which my friend and colleague, Mr. MOORE, has devoted his splendid talents as a Member of this House.

We have frequently heard the statement made that sectionalism and favoritism play a part in the making up of these bills. Therefore, I deem it well to give the House some figures relating to the Delaware River, in which my colleague, Mr. MOORE, and I are so deeply interested.

No one in this House who knows the facts will question the advisability of the Government making generous appropriations for the maintenance and improvement of that great river. The commerce on the Delaware River amounted to over 28,000,000 tons, with a value of \$1,229,000,000, last year. Surely so important an avenue of commerce as that should not be neglected, especially when we consider the large amount of revenue which the Government collects at the port of Philadelphia.

Our present project calls for a 35-foot channel from Philadelphia to the sea, and we in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania and neighboring States hope that liberal appropriations will be made by this committee in future to make certain the completion of that project within the next five years. Since my friend and colleague Mr. MOORE came to Congress there have been appropriated for the improvement of the Delaware River the following sums:

In 1906, \$1,000,000; in 1907, \$895,000; in 1908, \$375,000; in 1909, \$515,000; in 1910, \$800,000; and the following sums since I was elected, in 1910—

Mr. MOORE. Will my colleague say, as a matter of history, that the 35-foot project was adopted in 1910?

Mr. DONOHUE. Yes. But in 1911, after the adoption of the project, there was appropriated by this House for the improvement of the Delaware only \$800,000.

Now, note what appropriations have been made during the last four years for this river, although it is a northern waterway, and although we have occasionally heard the charge of sectionalism offered:

In 1912 there was appropriated for the Delaware \$1,750,000; in 1913, \$2,000,000; in 1914, \$1,000,000 in cash and \$1,000,000 in authorization, the latter having been lost in the Senate; this year we carry \$1,500,000. In the six years that my colleague was fighting for the improvement of the Delaware River, before my time, the average amount appropriated was \$731,000 per year. In the four years that we have been here the average amount has been over \$1,800,000, or, in other words, under this Democratic House the Delaware River, this great northern project, the worthiness of which no one has questioned, has received more than twice as much per annum as it received in former years.

Mr. MANN. And the Treasury is empty as a consequence. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DONOHUE. The gentleman will not say that that is the cause of the emptiness.

Mr. MANN. That is one of the causes to empty it.

Mr. DONOHUE. It helps to do it, of course.

Mr. MANN. There are other causes that prevent its filling up. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DONOHUE. I understand the gentleman is in favor of removing bars everywhere; why not those in the Delaware River?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, what is the question before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired, and there is nothing before the House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like one minute more.

Mr. DONOVAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Delaware River had received more money than ever before on account of his membership on the Rivers and Harbors Committee?

Mr. DONOHUE. Not at all. On the contrary, it is because this Government and this Congress have at last recognized the worthiness of the project to a greater extent than ever before.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I did pay tribute in a few brief lines to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants?

Mr. MOORE. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes all debate be closed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in a few brief words a while ago I did pay a compliment to my friend and colleague—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I think I had better make the point of order of no quorum, if we are going to do no business but sit here and listen to hot air.

Mr. MANN. We got used to that this morning, when the gentleman was talking. [Laughter.]

Mr. DONOHUE. I trust the gentleman will not make that point, in view of the patience we displayed this morning.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, in a few brief words a while ago I did pay a compliment to my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE], and I did that because during the last four years there have been times when it has been said by busybodies outside that he and I did not thoroughly agree on rivers and harbors matters. He came into this House rather unexpectedly four years ago, and he duly appreciated the compliment. On his arrival he was placed above the heads of all others on the very important Committee on Rivers and Harbors. That was a great tribute to his genius and ability. Prior to that time, however, some of us had been working for the Delaware River earnestly, and had been striving for a 35-foot channel. The effort was successful, and the project was written into the law shortly before my friend appeared upon the scene. But, nevertheless, I undertook, to the best of my ability, to aid him in his new position as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The work which had been mapped out under a Republican administration, partly at my instance, was to secure for the Delaware River an appropriation, in accordance with the project report, of \$2,000,000 per year.

The gentleman doubtless did the best he could to secure the \$2,000,000 per year, but coming into a great body like this and meeting distinguished men from all over the country, who had kindred projects, some of them coming from the Pacific coast and some of them from the shores of the Great Lakes, he found that other influences tended to operate against his ability and genius. There were times when the \$2,000,000 were cut down to \$1,000,000 and then to \$700,000, so that when the cost of maintenance of the river was taken out, there was very little left for original work. The result of that has been that, strive as he did and earnest as he was to carry on the work that the Republican administration had mapped out for him, the appropriation under the Democratic régime fell short of the schedule, and last week the Navy Department decided it would not send up the Delaware River any of its 19,000-ton colliers to bring away coal from Philadelphia, which it could do at a cost of 20 cents per ton less than from any other point.

Mr. Chairman, I would not have my colleague go away with a bad taste in his mouth, nor would I feel true to myself if I permitted him to go without saying these kind words, but nevertheless he followed so well as he could the program that was mapped out for him by a wise and provident Republican administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to condemn a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co. where the line of said waterway intersects said railroad tracks, the basis of condemnation to be the building, maintenance, and operation of a proper drawbridge by the United States, or the payment by the United States to the railroad company of such sum of money as may be awarded in the condemnation proceedings, as full compensation for such right of way, including actual cost of constructing such bridge and the capitalized cost of its maintenance and operation, whichever method may, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, be deemed most advantageous and economical to the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I make the point of order, or I will reserve it, if anyone desires to talk to the matter.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. This improvement is entirely different from the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal project, in that this waterway connects the waters of the Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, a distance of about 12 miles, and through much of that distance it simply connects up other streams. True it is that a part of the way it will be necessary to make excavations through the highland. On page 368 of the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, 1914, part 1, we find a description of this improvement under the title "location," which is as follows:

#### LOCATION.

This canal, situated in the southeasterly part of Sussex County, extends from Rehoboth Bay northward through the highland west of the town of Rehoboth Beach to Gordon Lake; thence through the



marshes back of Cape Henlopen to Lewes River. It follows the latter and Broadkill River, emptying into Delaware Bay about 5 miles above Cape Henlopen. The length is about 12 miles.

That shows that we would have the waters of the Gordon Lake and the Broadkill River and the other part of the way through the marshes and through some highlands. This is a project that was adopted several years ago. In the act of July 25, 1912, an appropriation of \$50,000 was made, and in the act of March 4, 1913, \$41,725, for carrying on this improvement. During the year last passed this work has been actually going on and is going on now. Dredging is being done. It is a project adopted by this Congress, appropriated for, and the work of excavation nearly done. This provision provides for extending this waterway under the tracks of the railway company.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROCKSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. While I am satisfied that the item is clearly subject to a point of order, I have no desire to make a point of order on a thing that ought to go through. I really had another matter in my mind on this paragraph. What is the object of this paragraph beyond what it says? What is the necessity of extending this waterway across the line of this railroad?

Mr. BROCKSON. Part of it lies on one side of the railroad and part on the other side.

Mr. MANN. Is it constructed up to the railroad?

Mr. BROCKSON. On one side it is constructed all the way up to the railroad.

Mr. MANN. And how near on the other side?

Mr. BROCKSON. I do not know the exact distance, but very near.

Mr. MANN. Under authority of United States law?

Mr. BROCKSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, under what sort of a plan has the Government been proceeding—

Mr. BROCKSON. Under acts of Congress.

Mr. MANN (continuing). To build a canal up to one insurmountable object on one side and then jump over that obstacle and go ahead with the canal on the other side. Were the vessels supposed to be leaping vessels to go over this?

Mr. BROCKSON. No. Back in 1896 there was a provision of law, an act providing for the condemnation of the right of way through the land of the railroad company. There was a condemnation proceeding had and an award of something over \$37,000, but my recollection is the money was not provided for the award. That was in 1896.

Mr. MANN. Now, this provision is that the Government shall maintain and operate a drawbridge, as I understand.

Mr. BROCKSON. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. I think there is no other place in the United States where the Government does that. Is that a cheaper proposition than to pay for crossing the right of way?

Mr. BROCKSON. Well, I am not informed about that. Just why they determined upon that plan I am not informed.

Mr. MANN. As I understand the gentleman, the Government did condemn, but we never paid the money?

Mr. BROCKSON. Yes. That was long ago. Now, it is estimated that the award is not sufficient to pay for the damages.

Mr. MANN. Well, this provides that they shall go across, as I understand, and build and maintain a bridge. Oh, I think it ought to have further consideration before we undertake to maintain a railroad bridge at the expense of the Government. If it is subject to a point of order, I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that this item has nothing to do with the improvement of rivers and harbors. It is an authorization for the Government to build and operate a railroad drawbridge for the benefit of a railroad company.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman there is a great deal more than that. It has everything to do with the improvement of a harbor. This is a waterway that has been under the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee for many years, and many appropriations recommended for it by that committee have been made by Congress. In some places perhaps you go through land, but the canal, I believe, has been dug—that is, where any canal is necessary. The improvement goes through navigable waters at one place, cutting through shoal water at another, through land at still another, and so on to the end. Now, there happens to be a railroad there under which or over which we have to condemn a right of way. The purpose of this provision is to condemn that right of way; and I can not agree to the proposition that every time in the improvement of a waterway where we happen to strike a piece of land, even the cut off of a corner, or run through a piece of land to cut off a bend in a river,

that we have to turn such work over to the Committee on Railways and Canals and confine ourselves alone to the channel of the river. Why, we did the same kind of work in the Calumet River in the gentleman's own district years ago, and the same point of order could have been raised against that work that the gentleman is making here to-day.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, the gentleman is not correct at all. I know more about the Calumet River than anybody else here. If such a thing was ever done or proposed to be done—

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is quite likely that the gentleman knows more about the Calumet River than I do, but I think I am not far from the fact.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, if a bill had been introduced for that purpose it would have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of the improvement of rivers, but when it comes to authorizing the construction of a railway bridge across a river, and a bill is introduced for that purpose, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors does not have jurisdiction of it. It goes to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, although the construction of such a bridge might dam up a river. That has nothing to do with the improvement of rivers and harbors, and neither has this. Here is a proposition to authorize the Government to make a trade with the railway company under which the Government shall build, maintain, and operate a proper drawbridge to be used by the railroad company, to be maintained and operated by the Government. And that is a matter that, if it was introduced in a separate bill, would go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and not to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. BROCKSON. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yield just there?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BROCKSON. In line 21 it says that the basis of condemnation is to be the building, maintenance, and operation of a proper drawbridge by the United States or the payment by the United States to the railroad company of such sum of money as may be awarded in a condemnation proceeding. It leaves it optional with the United States to decide.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whom it leaves it optional with. It is subject to a point of order if one of the provisions is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, what is this waterway? It consists of a series of natural waterways and partly artificial waterways. On page 368 of the Chief of Engineers' Report I read this language:

*Location.*—This canal, situated in the southeasterly part of Sussex County, extends from Rehoboth Bay, northward through the highland west of the town of Rehoboth Beach, to Gordon Lake; thence through the marshes back of Cape Henlopen to Lewes River. It follows the latter and Broadkill River, emptying into Delaware Bay about 5 miles above Cape Henlopen. The length is about 12 miles.

So that this waterway connecting Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay consists in the improvement of natural waterways in part and in part of artificial construction. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this is not a canal in the sense in which the gentleman makes his point of order challenging the jurisdiction of this committee. It is a waterway partly natural and partly artificial, and, in addition to that, it has been heretofore adopted and is a recognized public work of the United States. It is too late at this time to lodge a point of order against the item in the bill. I submit, further, this view, Mr. Chairman. In the construction of this improvement, this waterway connecting Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, it intersected the track of this railroad. Some arrangement had to be made for condemning the right of way owned by the railroad and through which the canal at that particular point was to be excavated. This item provides that there shall be condemnation proceedings and the amount awarded shall be ascertained by two alternative methods. By one method the railway is to be paid an amount representing the capitalization of the cost and maintenance of the bridge, to be maintained by the railroad itself, and the other alternative representing the value of the right of way to the railroad company, the bridge to be constructed and maintained by the United States. So that this is a mere incident in the construction or improvement in this waterway connecting Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay; and in order for its completion, intersecting this railroad track as it does, it is necessary—the title not having been acquired voluntarily—to authorize this condemnation proceeding. This item does authorize it, and the basis of damages is to be ascertained in this alternative method. So that for all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I suggest, if the gentleman should insist on his point of order, that it is not subject to a point of order;



that the canal is merely incidental; that the waterway as a whole and the condemnation of this right of way is even less incidental to it; and Congress, having acquired jurisdiction heretofore, will maintain it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will indulge me for a moment, I do not think that anyone can deny the fact that this appropriation is for a canal, for I direct the Chairman to the report of the Chief of Engineers on this project, page 368, where he says that it is for "a canal 6 feet deep, 50 feet wide, through the marshes and Lewes River, and 40 feet wide where it passes through deep cutting, including also the construction of two bridges."

The bare question is submitted to the Chairman for a decision whether the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction over canals, and if there is anything well settled it is the fact that that committee has not jurisdiction. I direct the Chairman's attention to a citation found in paragraph 4220 of Hinds' Precedents, that was referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], relating to the construction of a canal on the Miami River, where the Chairman held that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors did not have authority to consider such a project. This is more objectionable than that, in this, that it provides for the construction and operation of a railroad bridge in the building of this canal. Certainly the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not jurisdiction for the construction of a railroad bridge. That would go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on Canals, if it is pertinent to a canal. I think the Chair should sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is made against the paragraph by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. It appears that this is a waterway, heretofore authorized and for which appropriations have been made, connecting Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, and that in its progress for some 15 or 16 miles it crosses certain navigable waterways and connects two navigable bodies of water.

In the judgment of the Chair that does not take away from it the character of being a canal. If the question as to this waterway were presented now for the first time, the Chair would hold that an appropriation for the purpose of building this canal or acquiring this canal was not proper in a river and harbor bill. There is abundance of authority on that question, and therefore would in that event hold this particular appropriation to be improper in this bill. But this particular waterway has been appropriated for heretofore in river and harbor bills, and the Government has been expending the money so appropriated in developing it. The point that this is a canal comes now too late. The fact that heretofore the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has included in its bill appropriations for this particular project, building a waterway or canal connecting these two bays, and incidentally connecting other navigable waterways with the sea and with each other, and that said items have been approved by the Committee of the Whole without protest and the bills containing them have been enacted into law, estops the House in Committee of the Whole from excluding now this appropriation from this bill for that reason.

But it is further insisted that this particular paragraph provides for condemnation proceedings, the basis of the condemnation proceedings to be the building, maintenance, and operation of a proper drawbridge by the United States or the payment by the United States to the railroad company of such sum of money as may be awarded in the condemnation proceedings, and in that event the proposition would resolve itself into an operation of that drawbridge in connection with this proposed excavation by the railroad company. The Chair thinks the matter of building bridges across any sort of a waterway is a matter that does not come within the jurisdiction of this committee. The fact that the particular waterway over which a bridge is to be built and maintained is not yet constructed does not help the matter any and does not give this committee jurisdiction, in the opinion of the Chair, of the building of this drawbridge or any other kind of a bridge at this place, and the Chair thinks the point of order is well taken. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is made and sustained on the part that provides for a bridge?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made to the whole paragraph and sustained as to the whole paragraph.

Mr. BROCKSON. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROCKSON: Page 10, line 9, after the word "Delaware," insert the following: "Continuing improvements, \$60,000: *Provided*, That"—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware should understand that whole paragraph is out.

Mr. BROCKSON. I desire to offer the language just stricken out except that part referring to the bridge, and then offer an additional amendment to that, if I may have the time in which to prepare the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand what the amendment is.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed over.

Mr. MANN. I am not willing that we should do that. We would be lost if we do that. What does the gentleman want to do?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman?

Mr. BROCKSON. I sent up a modified amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, after line 7, insert the following:

"Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to condemn a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co. where the line of said waterway intersects said railroad tracks, the basis of condemnation to be the payment by the United States to the railroad company of such sum of money as may be awarded in the condemnation proceedings as full compensation for such right of way, including actual cost of constructing such bridge and the capitalized cost of its maintenance and operation, whichever method may, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, be most advantageous and economical to the United States."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that. Evidently the gentleman did not get his amendment in the shape he wanted it.

Mr. BROCKSON. The amendment is this:

Improving inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.: For continuing improvement, \$130,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to condemn a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co. where the line of said waterway intersects said railroad tracks, the basis of condemnation to be the payment by the United States to the railroad company of such sum of money—

And so forth.

Mr. MANN. I will consent to its going over, if the gentleman will not call it up when I am out of the Chamber.

Mr. BROCKSON. I will not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent that he may return to this item for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Corsica River, Md.: Completing improvement, \$4,800.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, and I request unanimous consent that my colleague and myself have 10 minutes to discuss this amendment, because it is very important to the city of Baltimore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, after the figures "\$4,800," line 4, insert the following: "Improving Curtis Bay Channel, Baltimore Harbor, Md., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 7, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$61,850."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that he and his colleague may have between them 10 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes to close.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from Florida asks five minutes to close debate, and that at the end of that time that the debate be considered as closed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I shall object to that, Mr. Chairman, because I might want a few more minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that he and his colleague have 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida that he have 7 minutes, and at the end of that time all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida whether he intends to continue the session this evening?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I have in mind to continue for an hour or two longer, perhaps until 9 or 10 o'clock.



Mr. MOORE. I have no objection to that, but there are several Members here who wanted to be informed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a very important matter to be considered, and I think it would be quite well to have more Members present during the consideration of it. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-nine Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Falconer	Kreider	Rothermel
Ainey	Fergusson	Langham	Rouse
Alexander	Finley	Langley	Rucker
Allen	Fordney	Lazaro	Rupley
Anthony	Francis	Lee, Pa.	Russell
Austin	French	L'Engle	Sabath
Avis	Gard	Lewis, Md.	Scott
Balley	Gardner	Lewis, Pa.	Scully
Baker	Garner	Lindbergh	Seldomridge
Barchfield	Garrett, Tex.	Lindquist	Sells
Bartholdt	George	Lloyd	Sherley
Barton	Gerry	Lobeck	Shreve
Bell, Cal.	Gill	Loft	Sims
Bell, Ga.	Gillet	Logue	Sisson
Booher	Gittins	McClellan	Smith, Idaho
Borland	Glass	McGillicuddy	Smith, Md.
Bowdle	Goldfogle	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Minn.
Britten	Good	McKenzie	Smith, Saml. W.
Brodbeck	Gordon	Maher	Smith, Tex.
Broussard	Graham, Pa.	Manahan	Stanley
Brown, W. Va.	Gray	Metz	Stedman
Browne, Wis.	Green, Iowa	Miller	Steenerson
Bruckner	Greene, Mass.	Mondell	Stephens, Nebr.
Brumbaugh	Griest	Morgan, La.	Stephens, Tex.
Buchanan, Ill.	Griffin	Morin	Stevens, Minn.
Bulkley	Gudger	Morrison	Stevens, N. H.
Burke, Pa.	Guernsey	Moss, Ind.	Stout
Butler	Hamill	Moss, W. Va.	Summers
Campbell	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Taggart
Cantrill	Hardy	Murdock	Talcott, N. Y.
Caraway	Harris	Neely, W. Va.	Tavener
Carew	Hart	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Carr	Hay	Nolan, J. I.	Taylor, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Helgesen	Norton	Temple
Church	Hinebaugh	O'Brien	Thomson, Ill.
Claypool	Houston	Oglesby	Towner
Collier	Howard	O'Hair	Townsend
Copley	Howell	Oldfield	Tuttle
Cox	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Cramton	Hughes, Ga.	Padgett	Vare
Dale	Hulings	Page, N. C.	Volstead
Danforth	Igoe	Palge, Mass.	Wallin
Davis	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. Y.	Walsh
Deitrick	Johnson, S. C.	Patten, N. Y.	Walters
Defenderfer	Johnson, Utah	Patton, Pa.	Weaver
Dillon	Jones	Peters	Webb
Donohoe	Kahn	Peterson	Whaley
Doolling	Keister	Plumley	Whitacre
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Post	White
Drukker	Kennedy, Iowa	Pou	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Powers	Wilson, N. Y.
Dupré	Kent	Prouty	Wingo
Elder	Key, Ohio	Rayburn	Winslow
Estopinal	Kindel	Reed	Woodruff
Evans	Kinkaid, N. J.	Riordan	Young, N. Dak.
Fairchild	Kirkpatrick	Roberts, Mass.	Young, Tex.
Falson	Korby	Roberts, Nev.	

During the calling of a portion of the roll Mr. MCANDREWS occupied the chair.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), finding itself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called, when 197 Members answered to their names, and he presented the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal and Record.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asked unanimous consent that he and his colleague—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe a proposition for unanimous consent is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair is about to state it. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that he and his colleague have 12 minutes in which to discuss the amendment offered by him, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent that in addition to that time he be allowed 5 minutes, and that at the conclusion of 17 minutes all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be at an end. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am not physically able to discuss this matter. We are not antagonizing this bill. We believe that this item would not cause any antagonism. It stands by itself. It is an item recommended by the

engineers at \$123,000, and last year the Committee on Rivers and Harbors appropriated \$61,000. It remained in the bill in the House and went to the Senate, and the Senate adopted the recommendation of the engineers and appropriated the total amount.

Now, there was a very bitter discussion on the Senate side about various items in the bill, but there never was a single word antagonizing this appropriation. What makes this appropriation particularly desirable is the fact that the Navy Department wants this channel deepened and widened so that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. can enlarge its piers and bring to that point the coal which is best adapted for the use of the Navy.

The president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. told me personally that as soon as this provision becomes a law the company is prepared to go to work to build its piers. The Navy Department can get its coal somewhat more cheaply and conveniently. It is handy to Chesapeake Bay, and for the reason stated the Navy Department is interested. It is a proposition of dual importance. It is important not only to our great city but to the Navy itself, and for that reason I offer the amendment. I desire to say that if the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had inserted the item and stated in the report why they did it, there would not have been a single word of criticism of the item on the floor of this House.

I yield the remainder of my time to my colleagues, Mr. COADY and Mr. LINTHICUM.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Chairman, this item was contained in the rivers and harbors bill that passed the House last year, but which failed of passage in the Senate; the only reason why it was not included in the draft of this measure was because of the determination of the committee to keep the total appropriation within a certain limit, so that in eliminating it the committee was not actuated by any opposition to it. In point of fact, the necessity of improving Curtis Bay Channel has been determined by both the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the House.

The pressing importance and wisdom of this proposed work is unquestioned. It would greatly aid navigation on this river and benefit the commerce that flows along its course. This channel has now a depth of only 30 feet. It is proposed to increase this to 35 feet, the same depth as the Patapsco River Channel that leads to Baltimore Harbor.

The appropriation provided for in this amendment is for the purpose of getting this increased depth, and is sufficient to do this. This work is recommended by Col. Beach, United States engineer, stationed at Baltimore, and his recommendation is concurred in by the Chief of Engineers of the Army.

In addition to this, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, has recommended it, and has pointed out its supreme advantages as a coaling place for our war vessels. It is ideally located and fitted for such a purpose. Many of our colliers have loaded coal there, but were compelled to come away each time with only a part of a cargo, because of the shallowness of this channel.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. has now a large coal pier on this river, from which can be loaded on vessels over 3,000,000 tons of coal a year.

There are many large manufacturing establishments on this bay, and an enormous tonnage is carried there annually.

Baltimore city has spent a great deal of money on its water approaches. It has more than matched every dollar the Government has spent there, and only last fall a large loan to further improve and deepen its harbor was authorized by our people. This money will be spent by us irrespective of the attitude of this Congress, and very soon the work will be undertaken.

Col. Beach, of the Army, said some time ago, in a report submitted to his chief, that this contemplated improvement is a matter of more than local importance, and affects the whole country in its influence upon the supply of coal for the Navy. It will help commerce and will prove of material benefit and advantage to our Navy.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. TALBOTT] for the deepening of the channel at Curtis Bay, which reads as follows:

On page 11, after the figures "\$4,800," in line 4, insert "improving Curtis Bay Channel, Baltimore Harbor, Md., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 7, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$61,850."

Curtis Bay is an estuary of the Patapsco River, about 3½ miles from the corporate limits of Baltimore city, and is adjacent to the harbor of Baltimore. I know this locality perhaps



as well as anyone could know it, having been born and raised within 3 miles thereof. Curtis Bay is especially well adapted for harbor facilities. It is surrounded on three sides by high hills, ranging perhaps from 150 to 175 feet, so that during the worst storms the waters are seldom troubled in the bay. It has practically what might be considered deep water throughout this locality, and remains deep because there are no particularly large streams flowing into it, hence, whatever channel is constructed will remain without very much expense.

The channel to Curtis Bay was dredged by the Government to the depth of 30 feet with a width of 250 feet, except near the terminals, where it has a width of some 700 feet. This channel connects with the 35-foot channel leading to the harbor of Baltimore, and the distance from this main channel of 35 feet to the Curtis Bay piers is about 2 miles. It is therefore proposed by my colleague [Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland] to deepen these 2 miles of channel leading from the main channel to a corresponding depth of 35 feet.

The city of Baltimore has expended several millions of dollars in dredging and in the construction of docks and piers. She is now about to expend another large sum in deepening her harbors from the main channel to these docks and piers. Baltimore and Maryland are not asking the Government to do anything except cooperate with them in giving Baltimore a depth of water sufficient for the tremendous trade which plies to and from foreign ports.

#### NO DESIRE TO CRITICIZE BILL.

It is not my desire to criticize the bill before us, because I feel that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have spent a great deal of time and labor upon this bill, and are doing what they feel is best with the money at hand, but we must realize that the State of Maryland, out of this great appropriation of \$34,000,000 included in this bill, is receiving only about \$45,600 for maintenance and completion of certain work. We are asking for \$61,850 to pay for one-half of the expense of the construction of Curtis Bay Channel, this being enough to carry us until the next river and harbor bill is enacted.

#### RECEIPTS FROM BALTIMORE.

I realize, of course, that seaboard cities are the gateways to the country at large, and the information I give as to the collections of the Government from the city of Baltimore are based upon that theory. The customs receipts at Baltimore, which includes Curtis Bay, for 1914, amounted to within a fraction of \$4,000,000 and the internal revenue paid in to the Government from our city aggregated about \$7,600,000, making a total income to the Government from these two sources of nearly \$12,000,000.

#### TONNAGE OF THE PORT.

The amount of tonnage reported for 1911, when the survey for the deepening of this channel was made, was approximately 2,300,000 tons, having a value of about \$12,000,000. The commercial statistics by water, both imports and exports, for 1911 are more accurately given in the following table:

2,047,382 tons of coal, at \$3 per ton.....	\$6,142,146
25,000 tons of fertilizer, at \$20 per ton.....	500,000
35,000 tons of fertilizer, at \$25 per ton.....	875,000
70,000 tons of fertilizer, at \$17.50 per ton.....	1,225,000
100,000 tons of naval fuel oil, at \$20 per ton.....	2,000,000
80,000 tons of chemicals, at \$14 per ton.....	1,120,000
	11,862,146

#### LARGE SUMS EXPENDED TO EQUIP FOR CAPACITY.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad has expended since 1910, \$60,000,000 for increased facilities and additional tracks to bring coal to this port, and even this year, in spite of the hard times, that railroad expended \$6,000,000 in constructing what is known as the Magnolia cut-off, in order to give further facilities and easy movement of trains to the port of Baltimore and Curtis Bay. The north and west banks of Curtis Bay are occupied by large manufacturing concerns, and the amount of business transacted there is very large, as I have said. The greatest business, however, is that of the shipment of coal. The present coal piers at Curtis Bay have a tried capacity of about 275,000 tons of coal—6,000 cars a month—approximately 3,300,000 tons a year, and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, which owns the big coal pier, has signified its intention, as soon as this channel is deepened, of building another, which will double the capacity.

#### NEEDED AS A NAVAL BASE.

The Navy Department is anxious to load coal at this point, but is practically prevented from doing so because their colliers carry 19,000 tons of coal and draw 30 feet of water. As this channel is only 30 feet deep, it is impossible to load the colliers to their full capacity, and it is both difficult and expensive to finish the loading in the channel leading to Baltimore, which is 35 feet deep.

A letter from Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Acting Secretary of the Navy, says:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 11, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to urge the favorable consideration by your committee in connection with bill for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country of an item of \$123,700 for deepening to 35 feet at mean low water the channel to Curtis Bay, Baltimore Harbor.

The Navy has had contracts for some years for the loading of coal at Curtis Bay, and the fact that this coal comes from one of our largest suppliers and is of the highest grade makes the Curtis Bay Harbor an asset of great military value to the naval service. This supply might easily become invaluable in time of war or of coal famine, due to strikes elsewhere, and it is respectfully urged that the item mentioned in the bill for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, which makes this supply available to the Navy's largest colliers, be favorably acted upon.

There is at present a 30-foot channel into the railroad piers, but this will not accommodate the latest type colliers, as the *Neptune* grounded in the channel in 1912. This dredging would be of great value not only to the Navy but also to the commerce of the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland.

Sincerely, yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

In addition to this, Mr. Roosevelt has told me that it is dangerous to load coal at Philadelphia to the full capacity of the colliers, as they are likely to be grounded in the Delaware River. It will cost many hundreds of thousands of dollars to dredge the Delaware River for these big colliers, and require considerable time, whereas for \$123,700 this Curtis Bay Channel can be deepened to 35 feet, which will accommodate the largest of them without any difficulty.

On March 20, 1912, Hon. Beekman Winthrop, Acting Secretary of the Navy, expressed the same views as Mr. Roosevelt as to the necessity of deepening this channel to 35 feet in order to equip it for loading coal for naval purposes. With the exception of Norfolk, there is no harbor along the whole Atlantic seaboard so important to the Government as a source of fuel supply.

Now, what is the use of talking about building a greater navy, when you will not spend \$123,700 to construct a deeper channel to Curtis Bay to coal that Navy?

The United States Government at the present time is practically confined to Norfolk and Newport News for its coal supply, but if you will deepen the channel to Curtis Bay then you will have a strong competitor for this immense trade. Not only will you have a competitor for the trade, but you also have more coal fields and different grades of coal to draw upon. It may be necessary in time or war to have more than one harbor in which to secure coal for naval vessels, but until you deepen Curtis Bay you are confined to Norfolk and Newport News. If you would load the colliers to their full capacity.

The Government requires and purchases for its naval vessels on the Atlantic side about 700,000 tons of coal each year. The freight rate for the coal fields reached by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad leading to Curtis Bay is \$1.35 per ton. The lowest rate which can be had to the Norfolk and Newport News Harbors from their nearest coal fields is \$1.40 per ton. If we take these lowest rates from the nearest coal fields, we have a difference of 5 cents per ton, and on 700,000 tons of coal it amounts to \$35,000. If you add to that what could be saved by competition, I venture to assert that the total amount of \$123,700, which it will require to complete the Curtis Bay channel, would be saved in each and every year. And this I say, in addition to the facts as I have alleged, the Government will be in touch with more coal fields and more railroads to haul it in times of necessity.

Certainly Maryland, which is only receiving in this bill \$45,600, is entitled to this consideration, and I can not see why the committee should not be able to trust this House sufficiently to amend and put in an appropriation for such an imperative project as the one before us. Why should a proposition in which the Government itself is interested and which costs such a small sum of money be deprived of attention merely because the committee says that it does not want any amendments to this bill?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I hate to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT], for I love him very dearly, and I hate to oppose the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] who is, I hope, to be the new governor of Maryland. [Applause.]

But I must do it. This is a new project; it has never been appropriated for before. It is true it was in the last bill, but the last bill failed in the Senate. This is on a par with New London; it is on a par with Bridgeport; it is on a par with 24 other projects in the bill. It is on a par with all new projects. Now, the House can do as it pleases, but I submit that we have come before the House with a conservative bill and it is a salutary rule that we adopted in the committee unanimously,



not to take on any new projects, and it would be very unfortunate to break it down in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. I am not opposed to this project any more than I was to the New London one, but the condition of the Treasury is such that in the real interest of river and harbor improvements I am compelled to object to any new item going into the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. BURGESS. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman realize that the difference in the freight which the Government would save by deepening this channel to Curtis Bay than to get coal at Norfolk would save more than this channel would cost in the course of a year? The difference in freight is about a dollar a ton.

Mr. BURGESS. That is the naval part of it. Yes; but that does not appeal much to me, although I think, perhaps, that is a matter to be considered when we take on any new projects, but it is idle to discuss the merits of any of these propositions. There were 74 new propositions, and they are coming on. Now, what will we do? There is no objection to these, gentlemen; I am sorry I have to take this position, but the gentleman from Maryland wants his improvement, Mr. MAHAN wants his, Mr. DONOVAN wants his, and here you go; and the only rule that could be adopted after much thought, after much discussion, was the one which we have come in and built this bill upon—that no new projects will be considered, no matter what their merits are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, yeas 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Anacostia River, D. C.: Continuing improvement, \$75,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 8, page 11, insert the following:

"Norfolk Harbor at Norfolk, Va.: The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for improvement of channels to Norfolk and Newport News, Va., are hereby made available for the widening of the channels and for the maintenance thereof, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document 605, Sixty-third Congress, second session."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes. I have consumed very little of the time of the House, and I hope there will be no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I shall not antagonize the committee. I shall support the bill. I am in favor of river and harbor improvements. And yet I feel that I should be neglectful of my duty to my constituents if I should fail to offer and ask for the adoption of this amendment.

When the rivers and harbors bill passed this House at the last session of Congress it carried, in addition to these balances, an initial appropriation of \$270,000 for the improvement of the channels to the ports of Norfolk-Portsmouth and Newport News. The project for this improvement was recommended by the resident district engineer, by the Board of Army Engineers, and adopted by the House. It was one of the few items not criticized by a single Member of the House or of the Senate while the bill was under consideration. It is an improvement which is absolutely necessary in order to properly accommodate the steadily increasing commerce of these channels and can not be criticized.

The last bill was defeated in the Senate and a bill carrying a lump appropriation, to be expended on existing projects, was substituted therefor. This lump appropriation bill was severely criticized by the members of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and partly for the reason that it confined all ex-

penditures to existing projects. I very much regret that the committee has seen fit in the preparation of its bill for this year to follow the same policy which last year it condemned. It has, without good excuse, confined all expenditures to existing projects and has absolutely disregarded the present as well as the prospective demands of commerce on other streams.

The fact that a project is a new one, no matter how meritorious and no matter to what extent its adoption may be in the interest of commerce, seems to have been sufficient to condemn it. And yet there are a number of these projects fully as worthy of improvement, on which expenditures can as wisely be made, and which expenditures will bring fully as good, and in many cases much better, results than many of the old ones.

I am willing to admit that a work once started, if the project is meritorious, ought to go on without material interruption to completion. But, in my opinion, it is quite as important that the efficiency of finished projects should be maintained and that new work should be undertaken whenever it can be clearly shown that steadily increasing commerce can not be accommodated and must suffer unless such work is done. I also admit that this is no time for the unnecessary expenditure of public money, and partly for that reason I am not asking for any new appropriation for the improvement of the channels leading to the ports of Hampton Roads. I am not asking for the appropriation recommended last year. My amendment simply provides that the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the improvement of these channels, and which have been saved by the economical way in which improvements heretofore authorized have been made, shall be made available for the work which has been recommended by the engineers. It does not increase the appropriations carried by this bill a single dollar. Is it right to neglect for a period of five years or more—the time it will probably take to complete the old projects—an improvement which means so much to the growing commerce of these great ports?

There has already been expended in the improvement of these channels a little over \$3,000,000. This is a much smaller sum than has been expended on the other great harbors on the Atlantic seaboard, and this will be true even after the expenditure recommended in the new project is made. And yet the present water-borne commerce of these channels is larger than the combined water tonnage of Wilmington, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, Fernandina, and Jacksonville, on the South Atlantic seaboard, and is probably as large as that of any port on the North Atlantic seaboard, with the single exception of New York. And yet the appropriations carried in this bill for the maintenance of some of these ports are larger than the appropriations carried for all streams in Virginia. Have the expenditures already made brought beneficial results? The commerce of these channels in 1888 amounted to less than 2,000,000 tons. With a speech made by the distinguished chairman of this committee on Tuesday, September 29, 1914, he filed a statement showing that the tonnage of these channels amounted to 28,307,501 tons and the value of their commerce to \$1,600,000,000. It is confidently believed that the tonnage of these channels now exceeds 30,000,000 tons.

My distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOVAN] said only a few minutes ago that any channel having a tonnage exceeding one and a quarter billion dollars in value ought not to be neglected. He is a member of the committee, and I agree with him. Why should these channels be neglected when others just like them are being taken care of?

This is 10 tons of commerce—last year's traffic—for every dollar expended in the improvement of these channels. How many of the channels provided for in this bill can show such results? Many of them show a commerce of less than 1 ton for every dollar expended, and most of them show a commerce of from 1 to 3 tons for every dollar expended for their improvement, and on many of them a larger amount has already been expended than on the channels to the ports of Hampton Roads.

What are the prospective demands of the commerce of these channels? The tonnage of these channels has shown for the past two years an annual increase of approximately 3,000,000 tons, more than the combined commerce of a large number of the old projects deemed of sufficient importance to be included in this bill. It is a false policy not to make any provision for a steadily and rapidly increasing commerce. It is a false economy to hinder and retard its growth. The country is not opposed to wise but to wasteful expenditures of public funds.

But I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not opposed to the improvement of our smaller waterways. I believe that any stream which, if improved, will bring results commensurate with the expenditures required for its improvement should be provided for. All these streams are useful arteries of trade, and, when improved and used, furnish a competition which



almost invariably results in a reduction of freight rates on the products of farm, factory, and mine. Expenditures made on smaller streams have added to the commerce of the ports of Hampton Roads and have been of material benefit to my section. But the great harbors of the country must not be neglected so long as the increasing business of these harbors imperatively demands still further improvement. In the improvement of such great harbors the people of the entire country are interested and benefited. Norfolk is a great distributing center. The volume of the daily carload tonnage to, from, and through the port of Norfolk-Portsmouth, according to figures recently compiled by the Chamber of Commerce of Norfolk, approximates in excess of 4,000 carloads daily, or more than 1,500,000 carloads annually. These figures show that, with the exception of New York, Chicago, and St. Louis, and probably one or two other cities, the city of Norfolk is the largest distributing center in the United States. And the development of the trade with the Pacific coast by way of the Panama Canal, which has been already inaugurated, will make Norfolk a still greater distributing center.

The width of the channel, for the widening of which this project provides, is now only 400 feet. There is not another port on the entire Atlantic seaboard, in which the same water tonnage is handled, which has as narrow a channel for the accommodation of deep-water commerce and which has not been provided for in this or some other bill. If greater width was needed for the accommodation of the commerce of these ports—and Congress has declared that greater width was necessary—then for the same reasons greater width is needed for the Norfolk channel. If the Government wisely expended its money for the widening of these other channels, then, at least, for the same reasons it would be equally as wise to expend money in widening the channels leading to the ports of Hampton Roads. We ask for the same treatment which has been accorded to the other great ports. We ask for no more than this, and we are certainly entitled to no less.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, there was a total of 466 ships to enter Hampton Roads from foreign ports, bringing imports valued at more than \$6,000,000. During the same period a total of 1,756 vessels cleared from these same ports with cargoes for foreign ports valued at more than \$25,000,000. During the same year a still larger number of steamships and vessels engaged in the coastwise trade handled a great part of the 1,500,000 carloads of freight which annually pass to, from, and through the ports of Norfolk-Portsmouth and Newport News. The total number of steamers and vessels, American and foreign, which entered and cleared through the customhouse at Norfolk during the past year was 5,456. This does not include the still larger number of steamers and vessels which are not required to register at the customhouse and which use these channels. It can readily be seen that such a great volume of commerce makes these exceedingly busy channels. Frequently as many as four and five vessels can be seen abreast in the Norfolk channel, and collisions are often barely avoided. The width of the channel is not sufficient for the present needs of its commerce nor for the safety of the vessels which use it. How can we accommodate a commerce which is steadily increasing at the rate of 3,000,000 tons per year without additional improvements?

It must also be borne in mind that the channel to Norfolk-Portsmouth is daily traversed by naval vessels, including the largest battleships and colliers, going to and returning from the Norfolk Navy Yard. Battleships, colliers, and ocean-going steamships are often seen abreast in the deeper channel and sometimes so obstruct it as to interfere with coastwise commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks permission to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. These battleships, colliers, and ocean-going steamships usually have a draft of more than 30 feet, and for their accommodation a channel 35 feet deep and 400 feet wide—and which is also used by other vessels—is clearly insufficient. It is true vessels of lighter draft ought to be required to navigate along the shallower sides of the channel, reserving the deeper channel for deep-draft vessels, but it would be impossible to enforce a regulation of this kind. A width of 600 feet, proposed in the new project, is barely sufficient to meet the present demands. Why place this channel at such a disadvantage and refuse to make these funds available for its improvement?

I know that the sensible thing to do when our revenues are decreased is to cut out unnecessary expenditures. But I also

know that our decreased revenues are amply sufficient to meet the actual needs of commerce, and that the country will approve a bill which carries for this purpose no extravagant or wasteful expenditure. If necessary, you could meet the actual demands by reducing appropriations for old projects and by using the sums saved in this way on new improvements. The country will not commend us for economy solely because we confine our expenditures to old projects and without reference to the present or prospective demands of commerce. The country will not applaud our good judgment when it ascertains that we have neglected great harbors and have at the same time made provision for projects which can promise no large returns. There are old projects provided for in this bill on which larger sums have been expended than on the channels to the ports of Hampton Roads, and whose commerce will not exceed 1 ton for every dollar expended in their improvement. If this is a wise expenditure of public money, then surely it would be fully as wise to make some provision for the improvement of channels which show 10 tons of commerce for every dollar expended on them, and whose annual increase in tonnage is larger than the prospective commerce of these other streams. A practical business man usually places his money where he can safely hope to secure the largest returns, and, if the profits are satisfactory, he never feels that he has made an unwise investment. And if our expenditures in the interest of commerce bring results commensurate with the cost of the work, the people will not complain that their money has not been wisely and economically expended. But they will condemn us if we expend it on projects, new or old, which promise no good returns.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted. I know that its adoption will be in the interest of economy and in the interest of commerce. My constituents know that they are entitled to this improvement, and your constituents can not criticize you if you assist me in making available for use funds which have already been appropriated therefor.

Gentlemen, accord to us the same treatment that you have already accorded to other harbors on the Atlantic coast. We ask for no more; we are entitled to no less. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say whatever as to the merits of this proposition. It is, I dare say, a good project. Indeed, our action in the last bill, the bill of 1914, in adopting it, showed what the committee at that time thought of it. I have not since had any reason whatever to change my views as to its merits. It is on all fours with several other new projects that we have not adopted and will not adopt if the action of this House to-day is to be taken as a criterion. It is similar to the Curtis Bay project, but possibly—although I do not wish to draw any invidious distinction between the two—possibly not as urgent as Curtis Bay, because that called for an increase of depth, while this project calls only for an additional width of a channel now being utilized. Then, too, it is a new project. If we were taking on new projects, I have no hesitancy in saying that I think this one would be adopted by us. At least, it would meet with my approval, as it did last year when we were preparing the 1914 bill. But unless we conclude to take on new projects, this should fall with other projects we have been considering to-day. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word in support of my colleague's proposition. The strength of his proposition consists of the fact that he is not asking for anything to be done that calls for the expenditure of any additional money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to say right there, if the gentleman will pardon me just a moment, that while that is true, it takes money that otherwise would not be expended for that purpose. It is money that is in the Treasury.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is lying there idle.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Like any money in the Treasury not having been appropriated. One word more right there. This is a project that calls for the expenditure of about \$1,100,000. The amount on hand is \$130,000, so that we would still have to appropriate about \$1,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the chairman permit an interruption?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that a great many other harbors, in which practically no greater tonnage is now being handled, are receiving under this bill something like a million and five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the gentleman will do me the credit to say that we are not discriminating and have not intended to discriminate against him in any way, because we showed that fact last spring when the other bill was being prepared. We then passed favorably upon his project.



Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say in behalf of this amendment, that the merits of the same have been fully presented by my colleague. The amount of tonnage and commerce at Norfolk, and the development that would follow from this improvement, have been presented by him in such a cogent way, that I can add nothing to it. The difference between this proposition, and the other propositions heretofore rejected is that there is a little unexpended balance in this case which has been left over as the result of other appropriations for work in that vicinity. My colleague simply asks that this little trifling sum—because it is a trifling sum in comparison with the merits of his proposition—may be appropriated and allowed to be expended in the development of the improvement in which he is interested. I think this committee could grant this request on the part of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] without impinging in any wise upon the rule laid down by the committee, and which has prevailed up to the present time. This is one project of a singularly meritorious character that may be easily differentiated on the facts from the others that have been rejected. It asks for but little expenditure at this time. It seems to me that the committee may very well maintain its consistency, and at the same time vote in favor of the proposition.

Mr. MAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee made the statement that one of the reasons why he would oppose this meritorious project was on account of the money it would take from the Treasury. Now, he is to be commended for taking that position, perhaps. But I think I can suggest a way to this committee that will relieve them of the embarrassment in that way and yet give this money to this most meritorious project. You have in your bill a project of \$100,000 for St. Lucie Inlet. Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

Mr. MAHAN. That project, Mr. Chairman, in the report of the resident engineer is turned down. In his report the engineer says there is no merit in it, and no commerce, and ought not to be approved. The recommendation of the district engineer was approved by the division engineer. That comes from the resident engineer, if I am not mistaken. From a conference held here in Washington it was thought best, from evidence received later on, to have another investigation, and that other investigation produced the necessary proof to bring this about. As I understand it, that is one of the projects that can well wait. There never has been a dollar used on that. Some two years ago \$100,000 was appropriated, but the bids received to do the work as advertised by the engineers were not satisfactory, and the only amount of that money expended was \$72.92 for advertisements. That being so, you have clearly \$100,000 for that item, which, in my judgment, can not be justified, and the money ought not to be expended, and if you defeat that appropriation you can easily give the money to the deserving project at Norfolk. That is only one of the many similar items that are contained in your bill and ought to be rejected.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, while loath to occupy the time of the committee, I think perhaps it is appropriate that I should say just a word regarding this amendment.

I live in a district in eastern North Carolina contiguous to the Virginia line, and Norfolk is our chief commercial port, so that substantially our people are as much interested in it, and I as their Representative feel as much interested in the great port of Norfolk as if I lived in that progressive city; so that if inclination were necessary in order to induce one to support this amendment I have that inclination as strongly as anyone could possibly have it.

Now, these are the facts, Mr. Chairman: No one questions that this is a new project, and in that respect it is similar to the other new projects which have been sought to be added to this bill. But gentlemen have tried to differentiate this particular amendment as a new project from other new projects, because they say if we adopt this amendment and thereby adopt the project you will not take any money out of the Treasury, but divert money which is unexpended from another project which has been completed and make it available for this project. Now, as to that money which was appropriated and not expended for another completed project, as the chairman said, it is in the Treasury.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will you name any other port on the Atlantic seaboard in which the same amount of tonnage is handled for which appropriations larger than the appropriations made for Norfolk have already not been made by your committee?

Mr. SMALL. Answering the question of my friend from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND], that simply affects the merits of this

proposition, and I am purposely avoiding any discussion of the merits. I will be frank enough—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do you not feel that the very same treatment ought to be accorded to the port of Norfolk that is accorded to these other ports for which you have voted appropriations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It will be treated the same when we get to it. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. SMALL. I am trying to be frank and admit the merits of this proposition. As the chairman said, after full consideration this proposition was included in the 1914 bill, which did not pass the Senate, and which did not become a law, so that I am purposely avoiding any discussion of the merits, and for the purpose of entire frankness I admit it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, it is a fact that this particular item has been rejected without reference to the demands of present or prospective commerce, and simply because it is a new project?

Mr. SMALL. It was not included in the bill for the same reason that the harbor of New London was not included in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will my friend permit another question?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; but make it as brief as you can.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, as a matter of fact, the committee, in the preparation of this bill, did not consider the present or future needs of commerce, but rejected projects for the sole reason that they are new?

Mr. SMALL. The project in this amendment, regardless of its merits, stands on a parity with the other 79 new projects which were in the 1914 bill, which did not become a law. They are not included in this bill for reasons of economy, as so fully explained in this discussion, and the only question presented to the Committee of the Whole is whether you will single out this project and adopt this amendment and leave out the other seventy-odd new projects, some of which perhaps were not altogether as meritorious as this, some of which did not involve as large a volume of commerce as this, and yet all of them having received favorable reports, and, in the opinion of the committee, sufficiently worthy to be recognized by an appropriation and to become adopted projects.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me one further question?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there a single other new project involving as great a volume of commerce as is involved in this particular project asking for as small an appropriation?

Mr. SMALL. While not undertaking to say that there is no other new project where the same amount of commerce exists as exists at the port of Norfolk, I do not recall the tonnage of all the ports sufficiently well to differentiate it so favorably in that respect. Yet I do say generally that there are other projects against which no criticism can be leveled; and if this is adopted, then they should be adopted. My friend is mistaken in his attitude that this project has such greater merit than other projects, as evidenced by the report of the Chief of Engineers. The report of the engineers, without taking the time to read it, shows that in the last paragraph the Chief of Engineers, simply, as in other projects, declares that it is advisable, and ought to be provided for by Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say, no reason has been given why this new project should be differentiated from other projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. The money sought to be appropriated here has been covered into the Treasury, and will remain there unless it is taken out by reason of this amendment. It is the same as if \$130,000 were appropriated directly out of the Treasury; and substantially the contention which has been so insistently set forth by the two gentlemen from Virginia has no foundation in fact as a matter of differentiation.

Mr. Chairman, one intimation here has been repeated more than once which ought to have no further expression in this House. My good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN], said something about St. Lucie Inlet, Fla. Let that item take care of itself when the time comes. We will discuss it then. But if it was intended by that reference to St. Lucie Inlet that the committee should draw any inference against the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] of



any unfairness to other projects, or injustice to other sections, or undue discrimination in favor of any project, simply because it is located in the State of Florida, as one member of the committee, who thinks he knows whereof he speaks, I repel that insinuation and inference, and in that attitude I believe I have the approbation not only of the committee unanimously but, as I hope and believe, of the entire membership of this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

James River, Va.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$100,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 13 and 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out all of lines 13 and 14.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have made a conscientious effort to find out what projects in the North were objectionable, and I have pointed out those that seemed to me, because of harbor facilities and matters of that kind, most open to criticism. I have done it, as I said, sincerely, and it is simply with that same purpose that I take up this project, to point out briefly what the engineers' report shows.

There is available, or was at the date of the last report, the sum of \$14,357. On this project there had been expended up to June 30, \$2,419,370. The appropriation calls for \$100,000. It is a project that was begun July 5, 1884, for a 22-foot channel from Hampton Roads up to the city of Richmond at an estimated cost of \$5,374. After a period of a little over 30 years we have completed 45 per cent of the project, and during all of the time in recent years the traffic has been stationary. There is a present depth of 18 feet. There is nothing in the engineers' report, so far as I can ascertain, which shows the immediate necessity for carrying on this project, which has been dragging along now for 30 years and is only 45 per cent completed. At a time when we are trying to save all the money we can in a large bill of this kind, I urge the importance of allowing this project to go over at least for the present, and for that reason I move to strike out the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin to strike out lines 13 and 14 on page 11.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: Continuing improvement, \$600,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 15 and 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out all of lines 15 and 16.

Mr. FREAR. This is an inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort, and it calls in the bill for \$600,000. It is a \$5,400,000 project, and on July 1, 1914, there was available the sum of \$820,115. With that large amount on hand, three-quarters of a million dollars at that time, this bill calls for \$600,000 more. This canal has very little traffic, as I am prepared to show if necessary. The traffic in 1903 was 203,812 tons. In 1912 it amounted to 90,337 tons. I want to read for a moment from the Engineer's report, page 461. This is the last report coming to the House, and it says:

Between Albemarle Sound and the Neuse River the present adopted route follows, successively, the Alligator River, a proposed land cut to Rose Bay, Rose Bay, and Pamlico Sound, but under authority granted by the act of March 4, 1913, surveys are now in progress to determine the relative advisability of adhering to this route or taking another. There is at present through the section a natural water route by way of Croatan Sound, having a navigable depth of 9 feet.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Has the board made any estimate and recommendation of what this whole thing will cost?

Mr. FREAR. Five million four hundred thousand dollars, and \$820,000 was on hand at the last report, and a survey is to be had to determine where the money for the project shall be expended.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On the 1st of November, I will say to the gentleman, there were only \$79,000 on hand.

Mr. FREAR. If that be true, it shows that on this project, which in 1912 shipped only 90,000 tons of freight, we have been able to spend over \$700,000. I want to call attention to one more item which includes the building of three bridges by the

Government at a cost of \$80,000. The engineers wanted a million dollars, but I am frank to say that the committee tried to stave off a part of it and gave them only \$600,000.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to get at the facts here. As I understand, there were \$800,000 that have not been expended.

Mr. FREAR. That was the balance on hand July 1, 1914.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How much money has been expended in all?

Mr. FREAR. The expenditures up to June 30 were \$576,300.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To that should be added the difference between \$77,000 and \$820,000.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; over \$700,000 was expended within four months.

Mr. SPARKMAN. From the 30th of June to the 30th of November.

Mr. CALLAWAY. What was it expended for, the purchase of a canal?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; for actual work.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state how the committee determines that it is necessary to have \$800,000 mentioned in line 16?

Mr. FREAR. The engineers, according to the report, asked for \$1,000,000.

Mr. DONOVAN. So it is based on something that they got from the engineers?

Mr. FREAR. I can not state to the gentleman what the committee's action was based on.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to ask the gentleman another question. I understand the report changes the original proposition, and that they are going to cut across a territory and run in a different way from what has been heretofore approved by the engineers.

Mr. FREAR. So far as the engineers' report is concerned, they are going to make surveys to determine where it is going.

Mr. CALLAWAY. They have had a little canal operating there with a little gasoline boat carrying about as much as a box car.

Mr. FREAR. I do not know the quantity, but believe it is small.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A year or two ago, before there had been a dollar expended on the intercoastal waterway from Boston to the Rio Grande, I tried to get this thing stricken out. The proposition then was to appropriate \$500,000 to buy a section of this canal to begin the work. Since that time there has been expended, according to the chairman, about \$1,320,000. Now, we have yet to expend the balance of \$5,400,000 on that project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. \$5,400,000.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Well, \$5,400,000. After studying this proposition of an intercoastal canal—this House heard the gentleman from Illinois to-day on this economic proposition, which he says is meritorious; no, not as meritorious as it would be to dig a canal from Chicago across the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, and I quite agree with him—we are called upon to go on and spend more money on this canal, which is a segment, according to the surveyor's original plan, of this inland waterway.

The question is with us whether or not we are going to continue this intercoastal waterway by appropriating the amount set apart for this section at this time, \$600,000. Looking at the engineer's report and the amount of commerce carried in that territory, and with my knowledge of ordinary everyday business, and with what I have of everyday common horse sense, Mr. Chairman, if it was put up to me, I would not, if I had the money, give \$600,000 for the Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk Canal, completed. What will go upon it? It will carry a few little lumber craft, oil boats, and the pleasure boats of those people from up North who go down South to winter, who have little boats which they can not risk out in the ocean. That is what it is for. It is not to carry freight. It can not be worth anything to this country as a whole as a commercial highway. The cheapest freight, and the only real cheap freight we have, is an open waterway we have out 3 or 4 miles off to the east of this canal from Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk, Va., in the Atlantic Ocean. It runs around to the Gulf of Mexico, and the cheap water rate we have on the southern coast of Texas is the Gulf. The freight there is carried in big boats that carry from 2,000 tons upward, with the propeller in the waist, and that run straight across big, open water.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and the paragraph close in eight minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have five minutes of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this proposition close in eight minutes, the gentleman from Texas to have three minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina to have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. That is on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. On this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object, because I want to get some information before I vote on this proposition, and I am entitled to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to give the gentleman what information I can.

Mr. DONOVAN. No; the gentleman from Texas ought to be allowed to continue what he wishes to say upon this matter.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, wherever a legitimate project is proposed and it is shown that it is a good investment, the kind of investment that a private individual with the whole field before him would go into if he was paying his own money out upon it, I would go into it, and not otherwise.

Digging a canal to parallel the Atlantic Ocean, to give a waterway to people who are on the coast, giving a waterway from Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk, Va., when they have the open Atlantic Ocean running from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet, S. C., is foolishness; it is time to stop. They want it to run just inside the shore, and for what? To accommodate the great ocean-going traffic? Oh, no; it is to be a 12-foot channel. What could it accommodate? Real traffic going along that shore which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says is driven in on the coast and wrecked? Oh, no. No ocean-going steamer could ever go into the canal. Last year, after we had appropriated \$1,300,000 for that thing, I made an investigation to find out what kind of traffic was running from Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk, Va., and I found there were two little gasoline boats drawing 3 feet of water running, each one of them carrying about as much as a box car, making the trip once a week each. [Laughter.]

I made investigation to find facts about small boats running on inland waters, and I found that the river traffic and canal traffic throughout the United States had been declining since 1881 to 1906, and was still declining—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Give me one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It was still declining, and that it had declined about 50 per cent from 1881 until 1906, and from 1906 until 1912 it was continuing to decline at about the same rate, showing conclusively that river and canal traffic could not compete with the railroads. But, oh; they talk about reducing freight rates. Trying to reduce freight rates when the Interstate Commerce Commission is raising freight rates is incongruous. The railroads say they can not live at the rates they now have, and we are pouring out on little inconsequential streams and impossible harbors millions and millions of dollars trying to lower freight rates, when the Interstate Commerce Commission, after going into the matter thoroughly, are raising freight rates in order that the railroads may live. Foolishness! Foolishness! Foolishness! What for? I am going to read into this Record before I quit the "what for." The fellows have shown it here in this discussion. What is the complaint made here, "that you do not give me enough. You are treating Dick better than you treat me. He was 9 and I was 8." That is the whole complaint against any feature of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Give me a minute more, and then I will quit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks for one minute additional. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, unless we reach an agreement as to the time to be consumed on the paragraph, I shall object.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the suggestion of the gentleman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in six minutes, the gentleman from Texas to have one minute and I to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in six minutes, the gentleman from Texas to have one minute and the gentleman from North Carolina five.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Make it eight minutes and I will quit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not make it anything. The Chair is simply stating the request.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I ask unanimous consent that it may be eight minutes, and five of those minutes be given to the gentleman from North Carolina and that I may have three.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the suggestion in reference to eight minutes—that three shall be given to the gentleman from Texas and five minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes, three to go to the gentleman from Texas and five to the gentleman from North Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina was on the amendment. I have no objection to closing the debate on the amendment in eight minutes, but I want to get some information in regard to this \$600,000 appropriation, and I can not get it from the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from North Carolina. I want an opportunity to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. Now, if they want to have this debate closed on the amendment, I have no objection; but if on the paragraph and all amendments thereto, I am going to object.

Mr. SMALL. How much time does the gentleman from Connecticut wish?

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DONOVAN. Did the gentleman address his remarks to me?

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DONOVAN. Five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Make it 13 minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes, 3 minutes to go to the gentleman from Texas, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, and 5 minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes, the gentleman from Texas to have 3 minutes, the gentleman from Connecticut to have 5 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina to have 5 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the whole trend of this argument that has been going on since this bill came up was, as I said, "You did not give me my share; you took too much and did not give me enough." Now, let us see if that is the way Members of this House work on this river and harbor appropriation bill according to the sentiment of the country and according to this River and Harbor Congress that worked so diligently in this matter. Let us see. Capt. Ellison—and this river and harbor committee know Capt. Ellison—the secretary and treasurer of the River and Harbor Congress, said:

It is not his fault as I see it, but our fault, and I use the word "our" in a nation-wide sense. We send him here to legislate for the Nation theoretically, but actually to get all he can for us; and if he does not get our share, and then some, we do our best to replace him with some other man, who takes better care of our particular congressional district.

That is what Capt. Ellison says. Is not that what you are doing? Oh, yes; that is what you are doing. Did you hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS] say, "How can I go back to my constituency if they put in this new project of the gentleman from Connecticut and I do not get a new project, and explain to them that I have done my duty in getting everything I could?"

Get everything you can get. That is the whole theory of this river and harbor bill and the way it is made up. I do not complain of these men. They are human. I have yet to go to any place and see a body of men that are not human. These organizations behind them are working at them to get all they can. The dredging organizations are working at them. The River



and Harbor Congress is working at them. How? Here is a report from an official of a dredging organization. Let us see what he says in reference to what should be done:

These entertainments do not entail any serious expense upon the association, but they do create the greatest possible prestige for our business in the estimation of those whose favor it is to our advantage to gain. Influential public men and men of business affairs having to do with transportation companies and steamship lines ARE ENTERTAINED by us on these occasions with the greatest possible benefit to our business—municipal officers, heads of departments, Members of Congress and of legislatures—and their favor and interest is legitimately gained and has been found to be of the greatest value when circumstances required it. THE EXPENSE OF OUR ENTERTAINMENT IS WISELY EXPENDED AND BRINGS AN ADEQUATE RETURN FOR EVERY DOLLAR SO SPENT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], I would say that I notice here an appropriation of \$600,000 for a waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in the language: "Continuing improvement." Could the gentleman, with his research, state how they determine that amount at \$600,000? How do they arrive at it?

Mr. FREAR. I presume the committee could give a more intelligent answer than I can, but I will venture this statement, gathered from the reports I have gone over quite fully and carefully. They are very large reports, and I have tried to get what information I could simply for this purpose. Five million four hundred thousand dollars have first been approved in that project, and then they make appropriations. They make recommendations to the committee. They have put in over \$500,000 already besides the \$800,000 they had on hand. The engineers now ask for \$1,000,000. The committee, in taking it up, has in its wisdom decided that \$600,000 is all they will put in the project this year.

Mr. DONOVAN. Let me see. The Board of Engineers has at some time authorized or recommended this appropriation, and they have done it in sections, so to speak—different amounts for different years. Is this the first year, or have there been several years before this?

Mr. FREAR. There have been other appropriations before, because \$500,000 have been expended before.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman know when, or not?

Mr. FREAR. No; I have not followed that out. The act was passed in 1912. The project was to cost \$5,400,000. An expenditure of \$576,805 had occurred up to June 30, 1914. So it was within two years that that money was expended.

Mr. DONOVAN. Do the engineers make a report every year, or, at least, when there is a new appropriation recommended by the Rivers and Harbors Committee?

Mr. FREAR. I understand they do, and request the amount that they can use either for maintenance or for the continuance of the project or improvement. Of course, I am not on the committee.

Mr. DONOVAN. Was there a report from the Board of Engineers this year for that \$600,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The estimate by the War Department for this year, to last until June 30 of next year, was \$1,000,000; but, when we undertook the task of cutting all the items, and particularly the larger items, we came to the conclusion that while they might spend, and could spend judiciously, no doubt, \$1,000,000 during the period mentioned, they could get along on \$600,000; and hence we allowed that amount.

Mr. DONOVAN. Now, the gentleman will say there was an appropriation made for this same work in some other year—a year ago, or two years ago, or whenever it was.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Two appropriations have been made before this.

Mr. DONOVAN. Exactly. Well, then, it is continuing that same work, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a continuation of that same work.

Mr. DONOVAN. Still, it is a new work—work that has never been done before?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is an old project.

Mr. DONOVAN. Like the Bridgeport project, that was adopted in 1889, modified again in 1906, and modified again in 1910.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This has not been modified, though.

Mr. CALLAWAY. They are fixing to modify it, though, by fixing another cut-off.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They are not arranging for anything of that kind now.

Mr. DONOVAN. Now, what is bothering me, Mr. Chairman, is to distinguish the difference between a new project and an old project. I understand from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] if there has been an appropriation made and afterwards it needs a deeper digging or greater widening of the channel it is an old project. Now, there is a conflict here amongst these experts. The chairman seems to think that it is not an old project to ask an appropriation, but calls it a new project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What new project?

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman from North Carolina claims when there has an appropriation been made for rivers and harbors that later should require deepening or widening that that would be an old project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That would be a new project.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the committee, but in view of some statements that have been made I will ask the attention of the committee briefly.

If there is one project in this bill which has been thrashed over in every detail more carefully than any other, which has been at times the subject of criticism and approbation more than any other, it is this waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. It is, I think, a fair statement to make that the facts upon which it is based have commended this project favorably to every citizen, either in or out of Congress, who is in favor of river and harbor improvements and who sincerely desires to determine the merits of the project. I will make just this brief statement—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. SMALL. I can not yield now, I regret to say. I have only five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SMALL. This waterway is about 185 miles long, from Norfolk to Beaufort. It intersects the inland sounds and waters of North Carolina, with three excavations through solid land, amounting altogether to not exceeding 12 miles, all of which have been excavated. It lies inside of Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout, the two most dangerous points on the Atlantic seaboard. It forms an outlet for the water-borne commerce of eastern North Carolina, having navigable rivers aggregating a total length of more than 1,300 miles and having navigable sounds with an area of 2,500 square miles and affords the only outlet of all that thrifty section, with a population of nearly a million, one of the richest agricultural sections of the South, to the outside world.

These statements in the main constitute the bases of its merits. It is a practicable proposition from an engineering standpoint. There have been three distinct surveys by three different boards of engineers, and every one of them has made an unequivocally favorable report upon it.

As to the commerce, in order to illustrate the inaccuracy—unintentional, of course—of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] about one gasoline boat, there passed through the upper end of this waterway in 1913, that end between Norfolk and Albemarle Sound, in all 8,465 vessels.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SMALL. No; I can not be interrupted. I commend to the gentleman to listen to me. It would be better for him. I can not be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SMALL. Eight thousand four hundred and sixty-five vessels. There was a tonnage also for the same year of 652,524 tons, of a total valuation of \$9,224,621. This commerce passed through this waterway in spite of the fact that it has deteriorated and was being maintained and in some sections under construction at the time, impairing the use of the waterway to an appreciable extent.

Taking it altogether, Mr. Chairman, based upon the proposition that it avoids our most dangerous coastwise navigation; that it affords an outlet to these numerous navigable rivers and navigable sounds in eastern North Carolina and is the only outlet for its water-borne commerce; considering the commerce which has already been attracted to it and which in the opinion of unbiased observers, the United States Engineers, will largely be increased when completed, in the opinion of unbiased men everywhere it is not subject to criticism, but is worthy of commendation as a waterway of conspicuous merit.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 10, line 8, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to the portion of the bill which was passed over. He has that right.

Mr. MANN. It was passed over by unanimous consent. He has the right to return to it.

The CHAIRMAN. He has the right to return to it under the unanimous consent, and the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BROCKSON. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROCKSON: Page 10, between lines 7 and 22, insert the following:

"Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del., continuing improvement, \$130,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to condemn a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co. where the line of said waterway intersects said railroad tracks, and any funds appropriated for improving said waterway are hereby made available for paying the award that may be made in said proceeding."

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, as appears by the pending bill, the committee included a provision for condemning a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co., but the bill carries no appropriation for that purpose. This project of the inland waterway between Delaware Bay and Rehoboth Bay is not a new project. It was adopted several years ago, and appropriations have been made at different times for the improvement of that waterway. During last year a considerable sum of money was expended in improving it. The work is still being done. It is only a question as to whether or not this bill shall carry an appropriation for continuing the work. I shall not take up time to discuss the merits of the project, because it has already been adjudged to be meritorious by the action of this House. At the last session of Congress the committee approved this project and included in the bill that passed the House \$60,000 for continuing the work. When the bill was reported from the Senate committee to the Senate it carried an item of \$109,000 for the continuation of the work on this waterway.

The Engineer's report for 1914, now before us, on page 369, contains the following recommendation:

Fund required. Amount that can be profitably expended in the fiscal year 1916 for improvement and for maintenance, \$130,000.

For that reason I have offered the amendment to appropriate the \$130,000.

The committee may call attention to the fact that there is a sum of money in hand, something over \$40,000. All the money in hand would probably not be enough to pay for the right of way through the property of the railroad company. It will be very expensive to the Government to have this work discontinued, because the machinery is all there and the work is now in progress. It should be continued. I submit that the provision for condemnation should be accompanied with an adequate sum of money to pay for the right of way when condemned. Therefore I submit that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment only embraced the idea of condemnation proceedings, we would have no objection whatever to it; but it undertakes to appropriate \$130,000, a thing which the committee, after thorough consideration of the matter, decided not to do. It was the purpose of the committee not to appropriate any money at all in this bill for this project. As has been said, there are about \$140,000 on hand, and, pending these condemnation proceedings, it was thought by the committee and by the engineers that the money on hand would be sufficient and that the payment of the award

under the condemnation proceedings could await another appropriation at another session of Congress.

We had before us Maj. Johnson, who has charge of that particular work. He spoke at some length before the committee, or some members of the committee, and without reading his entire remarks he said:

We are going to save about \$50,000 to \$75,000 on the estimate. If nothing was allowed—

Meaning in this bill—

not much damage would be done. It will take some time to go to the courts and get the right of way across the railroad. That is the next thing which should be done.

So, with the opinion of the engineer before us, that no harm would be done if we made no appropriation, that it was unnecessary at this time to appropriate the money to meet the award to be made by the jury impaneled for the purpose of condemning the land, we concluded not to insert any provision for an appropriation in this bill, and for that reason I hope this amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, between lines 7 and 22, insert the following: "Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del., continuing improvements, \$60,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to condemn a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland, & Virginia Railroad Co. where the line of said waterway intersects said railroad tracks, and any funds appropriated for improving said waterway are hereby made available for paying the award that may be made in said proceedings."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How many amendments can the gentleman from Delaware offer at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the agreement was that we should recur to this point in the bill, to enable the gentleman from Delaware to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. He has offered one; can he keep it up all night?

Mr. BROCKSON. I have only one more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is in order.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment should be adopted; otherwise we impeach the judgment of the engineers and the committee of the House of the last session of Congress, and Congress itself. Before the last session the engineers recommended \$60,000 and deemed it necessary to carry on this work, and to pay the award under the condemnation proceedings. This money is not all to pay for condemning the property of the railroad company. The committee believed in this item and incorporated it in the bill at the last session. The House believed in it and passed it in the bill. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

One other thing I wish to say. Of course, I understand, that these bills are not made up by States or according to the location of Members, or anything of that sort. I also understand there is a desire at this time to economize. In that I heartily concur, but I do contend that the economy should be equitably distributed. The bill passed by the House at the last session for the projects within the State of Delaware carried \$186,200. Now the pending bill carries \$91,000, a reduction of more than one-half. If that sort of reduction would be practiced throughout the United States, we would have a bill here about one-half the size of the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, between lines 7 and 22, insert the following: "Inland waterway, between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.: Continuing improvement. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to condemn a right of way through the tracks of the Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co. where the line of said waterway intersects said railroad tracks."

Mr. BROCKSON. This amendment provides simply for the condemnation of right of way through the tracks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Beaufort, N. C.: For maintenance, \$17,000.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.



The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out all of lines 19 and 20.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Looking at page 1943 and pages following in the Engineer's report for 1914, on page 1945 I find a map of this Beaufort inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., and of this canal. Down in the right-hand corner, at the bottom of this map, I see "Improving inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C." Right under that I see a dotted line marked "Route adopted by Congress," which is clearly marked on the map. Still below I see a line dotted in another way with smaller dots, "Proposed change in route under examination." The route adopted by Congress runs through Pamlico Sound into the Neuse River. The proposed change in the route under examination runs some miles farther inland. It runs from the point of Alligator Bay to Bellehaven, and from Bellehaven, across the mouth of Pamlico River, inland again across into the Neuse River. I want to know from this committee whether this route was originally surveyed by these engineers who never make any mistake, who scientifically investigate every proposition from the standpoint of feasibility and economy? We have already approved this project and appropriated over thirteen hundred thousand dollars, and now they propose a change in route.

Mr. SMALL. We have appropriated fourteen hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Worse still! I ask the gentleman now, after we have adopted the route and expended fourteen hundred thousand dollars upon it, if it is not a fact, according to this engineer's report, the engineers have a proposed change in the route, and that, so far as that part of it that is changed is concerned, it would almost double the expenses? Is not that true?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is not discussing his proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, and that is a matter that we have already passed upon, but I will be very glad to answer the question of the gentleman. In the river and harbor act of 1913 there was authorized a reexamination of the southern end of this waterway, with a view of determining whether there should be any change in the route in order to avoid a part of the route across Pamlico Sound, which is quite exposed. The engineers have reported on that. What their report is I do not know, because it has not yet been printed. I hope that answers the question of the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, in this Committee of the Whole we have voted to appropriate \$600,000, carrying out this original proposition which we adopted, which, according to the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], and according to the showing of the engineers, is proposed to be changed just about the time we get the thing completed. They have already opened it for commerce, and the gentleman says, in answer to my statement, that an immense amount of commerce has been going on in that section of the country. He did not meet the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, he did not answer the statement that I made. It was this: If it was not a fact that that canal from Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk, Va., only had two gasoline boats on it running full length? What would you think of a railroad in this country that never had a single through line of cars running from end to end? It would be a great traffic line, would it not? What would you think about the great transcontinental railroads if there was not a single through train? If when you shipped from Chicago to San Francisco, you would have to reship every 30 miles, would not that be a great transportation line? That is the situation on this canal, which he says is a great line of commerce 185 miles long, and then goes on to show the freight that is on it. The statement that I made was that there were two little gasoline boats running once a week each from Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk, Va., and that was all the through traffic upon it. A great line of commerce!

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman ask me the question and want an answer?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; I told you that. [Laughter.] You disputed it.

Mr. SMALL. No; I say that the gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And I will tell you what you would not do for the enlightenment of this committee. You would not tell them the number of the through boat lines that are on it, and the names of the companies that run them, and you never have, because that information shows that if we want to

travel as passengers we would have to reship a dozen times. How many times would we have to lay over and how many times would we have to recheck our trunks with a dozen different companies to get 40 miles on one of these propositions? Nobody travels on them, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking two or three questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas is still pending.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and the paragraph end in five minutes, two minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from Texas and three minutes by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] had the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understood the gentleman rose to ask a question.

Mr. SLOAN. I do want to ask a question. However, I will move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MADDEN. I object, unless the gentleman from Nebraska can have three minutes in addition to the time suggested.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection; I thought he simply got up to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the proposition which the gentleman from Florida makes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That debate on this paragraph end in five minutes, three minutes to be used by the gentleman from Nebraska and two by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes—three minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from Nebraska and two by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I expected the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] in his closing discussion on the canal would have yielded to some of us who desired to ask some questions, but he refused on account of the lack of time. I want to suggest these practical questions to him. If we are putting \$600,000 into this canal, and this harbor is at the end of the canal I understand, who is to control that canal? If the United States is to control it, is it to be free for United States shipping? Is it to be free for the shipping of the world? And if, in the course of a change of administration or any repudiation of some platform, can the control of that canal, which is the second important canal that the United States has constructed in point of expense and in magnitude, under any circumstances be transferred in whole or in part to any other power? The American people are interested, to some extent at least, in knowing if it invests a number of millions of dollars in this second great canal—first, that the United States shall, under all circumstances, control it absolutely; that it shall be free to American shipping; and that we should charge for foreign shipping if we see fit. Those were the questions I desired to submit.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman assume that this canal is of sufficient consequence to admit of any foreign shipping? [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I do not know; it is not constructed yet.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment pending affects Beaufort Harbor, and the discussion has been upon the waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., which had already been passed upon. If only occurs to me to say this, Mr. Chairman. I of course assume that the gentleman from Texas thought he was stating facts and the true conditions regarding this waterway, but as a matter of fact he has been misinformed. The statement I made in my remarks just a few moments ago about the number of vessels passing through this waterway for 1913, the last fiscal year in which we have data, is correct, and the amount of tonnage and the valuation of that tonnage is correct, as reported by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman endeavoring to answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. SMALL. I am coming to that now.



Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman's time will be up before he reaches it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMALL. I will advert to the inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska. This waterway, Mr. Chairman, is exclusively the property of the United States and under its exclusive jurisdiction, and it is free to the commerce of the United States, and I presume of all nations, provided it be carried in our vessels. It is to have a maximum depth of 12 feet, which draft I do not think will attract any foreign shipping, but it will be a very important factor in the development of our domestic commerce. I hope that answers the inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska withdraws the pro forma amendment and the question—

Mr. SLOAN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment but not the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the pro forma amendment; and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] where this particular inlet is? Beaufort is opposite Morehead City. You have passed an appropriation for the harbor. Now, where is Beaufort Inlet?

Mr. SMALL. I am surprised that the gentleman, who has displayed such familiarity with the coast line of New England, should feel impelled to ask a question about so important an inlet as Beaufort, on the coast of North Carolina. It lies just south of Cape Lookout, about midway the State.

Mr. DONOVAN. That is good. Now the gentleman will acknowledge that Morehead City is opposite Beaufort, will he not?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; on the opposite side of the harbor or bay.

Mr. DONOVAN. Exactly. And Beaufort Inlet is the water running south from there. That is what you call the inlet, is it?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; running from the harbor into the ocean.

Mr. DONOVAN. Can there be two harbors there?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Beaufort is on one side of the harbor and Morehead City on the other?

Mr. SMALL. As a matter of fact, they are separated by shoals.

Mr. DONOVAN. And that is what you are appropriating money for, that shoal water?

Mr. SMALL. You ask why there could be two harbors on one body of water. One harbor is in front of one place and one in front of the other, but they are separated by shoal water.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is not Beaufort on the ocean side?

Mr. SMALL. No; neither one is on the ocean side. They are both on the inside of the inlet. Beaufort lies east of Morehead City.

Mr. DONOVAN. Let me finish the question. Morehead City is on the mainland?

Mr. SMALL. And so is Beaufort. Separated by a bay and Newport River.

Mr. DONOVAN. Well, then, I do not know it when I see it.

Mr. SMALL. May I extend an invitation to the gentleman to go down with me and inspect it?

Mr. DONOVAN. I own property down there, I will say to the gentleman. I am the owner of property there, and I have been there and I know about the commerce on that river. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] has stated the truth. In order to go up that waterway I had to get on a little mail boat. The mail would not carry as many passengers as there are men in this section here. That was the kind of transportation I had with which to go to Davis.

The gentleman is acquainted with where Davis is located down there. It is the finest place in this country for raising fish, oysters, and crabs. The water is clear and pure; there is no sewage, there is no manufacturing, and nothing to soil the water. And the shore running from the strip of land and the ocean proper to this so-called sound—the gentleman from North Carolina called it shoals—why the grass runs off from it into shallow water two or three hundred feet, and makes a great feeding place for ducks. They come there in the spring of the year. A few men from the North, who have a little more money than anything else, go down there for recreation and shoot the ducks, and that is the principal business, except to stop in the hotel on the way to the feeding ground in Beaufort city.

Mr. BURGESS. How many ducks did you kill?

Mr. DONOVAN. I have them yet to kill.

I am surprised to think, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] did not answer the gentleman from Texas about the commerce and about the boats that run from one end of the waterway to the other. He could not answer, because they were not there and have not been there.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut withdraws his pro forma amendment.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out lines 21 and 22.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I made a statement which the gentleman from North Carolina has been saying he wanted to correct me about. I ask him, for heaven's sake, to tell this House the names of the boats that make regular trips from Beaufort Inlet to Norfolk, Va., and give the names of the companies or men that own them, so we can find out whether or not the statement is correct. And he has not named them. He will not name them. He is in exactly the same position that this committee has been ever since I began fighting this river and harbor bill three years ago. Instead of giving you any information that is of worth they never give you any understanding of the commerce and traffic that goes over the river and who it is that wants to use it; they do what they can to conceal the facts and then get raw, raw, raw when anybody criticizes them.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean to insinuate that there is no commerce on this great waterway?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I told you that there were two gasoline boats last year, drawing 3 feet of water, that would carry about as much as a box car, that made a weekly trip through that canal from Beaufort to Norfolk, Va.

Mr. MADDEN. Do you say they made tri-weekly trips? Try to go up one week and try to get back the next?

Mr. CALLAWAY. And so it is with inland transportation on waterways all over this country.

Everybody that has ever given this subject any study at all knows that transportation is playing out on the rivers and playing out on the canals. It can not compete with the railroads. Yet these men here are throwing millions of dollars of the people's money into these projects year after year. Instead of getting an increase of commerce on these rivers they get what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] shows they were getting on the Ohio, Mississippi, and every other river in this country—a continual decrease in the transportation from year to year, as the rail transportation through that country increases 10 and 20 and 50 and 100 per cent a year.

Why do not they come up to the rack and tell the truth about these conditions and meet them as they are instead of bending about the bush on questions like this and trying to mislead the committee as to the statements I made about the traffic that goes from one end of that canal to the other? I told the truth about it. I tell the truth every time I hit. I have not an interest on earth, none in the world, in that thing over there, save to see that justice is done. I have no interest in any water-carrying concern, nor in any line of commerce in the way of rivers in any section of this country. There are no navigable rivers in my district, notwithstanding the Trinity and Brazos both run through it. [Laughter.]

What I want is an honest expenditure of the money that is put into the Federal Treasury, because I know how it goes in there. I know something about what it takes to earn an honest dollar when a man has to bend to it his energy and his brawn and brain. Before I came to Congress I earned all the dollars I got. [Laughter.] Since I have come up here I have doubted very much if I earned anything. [Renewed laughter.] But if I can succeed in the course of my service here in helping to kill this river and harbor waste, I shall have done something to earn my salary; and if I stay here, I hope to get the scalp of this thing by the help of other men.

I am determined on it; and if I had just known enough about the rules when I first came here to have known that the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois would go to the canals paralleling the ocean, I would have decapitated all of them in the beginning, because I came in about the time they got to appropriating the money to build the canals running along next to the ocean, so that you might have water transportation from Boston around to the Rio Grande River. [Applause.]



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pamlico and Tar Rivers, N. C.: Completing improvement up to Greenville and for maintenance of improvement above Washington, \$35,800.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 5, 6, and 7 on page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out lines 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this covers continuing the improvement, and the character of the improvement is such that I believe it ought to be known by the House. We have appropriated already \$322,863 for this river. It is the same river, having a different name in two different States. In October, 1914, \$19,038 was on hand. The present project is for a channel 200 feet wide and 10 feet deep, and it is 77 per cent completed.

To show the difficulties under which they are laboring down on this river, the Engineer's report on page 475 states that owing to a greater number of logs and snags being encountered than was anticipated, the estimated cost of the project was increased in 1913 by \$15,000 and again in 1914 by \$23,500, making the total revised estimate of the cost, \$132,550.

Here is the kind of work that was done upon that river last year. By the way, it is navigable from three to six months in the year, during freshets. I call the attention of my friend who has charge of the Trinity River [Mr. CALLAWAY] to the fact that here is a stream that for three months of the year, during freshets, has navigation of some kind. Gentlemen, I pay my respects and my apologies to the Kissimmee River for whatever was said against it in times past for failure to have navigation. I think that had four months of water.

The engineers in 1913 pulled 5 snags, 510 stumps, 6 logs, 16 sawlogs, 1 scow, and 1 old house out of the river. [Laughter.] That is the statement in the engineer's report. The question that comes to us now is to know what was the line of demarkation between the land and the water in this particular river, especially as regards the location of the house.

The commerce is 90 per cent timber. That is downstream. Upstream it is 50 per cent timber. That is the character of the project for which \$35,800 is asked, which is 77 per cent completed. In view of the facts, and in view of the condition of the Treasury at the present time, and the objectionable features of the war tax under which we are living, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that part of page 12 which refers to this project.

Mr. SLOAN. Strike out the war tax.

Mr. FREAR. I will take that as an amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR.]

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Smiths Creek, N. C.: For maintenance, \$2,400.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$2,400," in line 11, and insert "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 11, strike out "\$2,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000."

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting down to about what is right. For a great many years I have contended that the rights of one man in this country are as paramount as the rights of all men. Here we have an appropriation for Smiths Creek. Is that great stream owned by the Government of the United States? Certainly not. Its name does not indicate it. Is it owned or controlled by the State of North Carolina? No. By the county in which it runs, when it does run? No. By any firm or corporation? I should think not. It is the sole property, sir, of Smith—and Bill Smith at that, I apprehend. [Laughter.]

Sir, I understand that this creek rises in the northeastern part of Smith's plantation and in a leisurely fashion winds its way from time to time almost 5½ miles in length—I think I have the proper data upon its length—and that it finds its

mouth, sir, in the southwestern portion of Bill's plantation. As I understand, he holds the absolute title in fee simple, an indefeasible title; a title, sir, that can not be alienated from him, deeded to him, his heirs and assigns, forever, with all the corporeal and incorporeal hereditaments, as well as other appurtenances thereunto belonging. [Laughter.] And I submit that, inasmuch as this Congress, from time to time, has been making lavish appropriations upon great streams like the Mississippi—I will not say the Ouachita or the Red or some other streams in Arkansas, because, unfortunately, those have been overlooked—we do know that the Ohio, the Tennessee, and many great national streams have been the recipients of the bounty of this Congress, as well as other Congresses in the past, then, sir, why should not Bill Smith have his creek improved at Government expense when he owns the title thereto? Now, Mr. Chairman, this great project, I suppose, is used by Bill and his family exclusively, except when the people from 2 or 3 miles around gather to disport themselves on holiday occasions and on the Fourth of July, when the neighbors come from around there to hold their regatta races. I submit that inasmuch as Congress has been liberal in making appropriations in the past, twenty-four hundred dollars is an extreme amount, and therefore I move to amend by reducing it to \$2,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] heard what the gentleman from Arkansas said in regard to Smith's having an inalienable and indefeasible right to this creek. As to the amount of the appropriation, the amount originally recommended by the Chief of Engineers was \$5,400, which was reduced by the committee to \$2,400, the lowest amount which can be used for its maintenance.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman tell us where Smith Creek is located?

Mr. SMALL. It is located in North Carolina, and is the harbor of Oriental, and has a fairly good commerce. It is a project meriting the appropriation which has been made in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CALLAWAY) there were 24 ayes and 60 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: For maintenance, \$8,000.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out lines 14 and 15.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question. In order to reach Beaufort Inlet from Pamlico Sound do you not have to go by the way of Core Sound?

Mr. SMALL. Formerly you did, but since the waterway has been opened up this is the best available route; in fact, the only one now used from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet. It has been improved since the gentleman was there.

Mr. DONOVAN. You have, in the next line, an item connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor.

Mr. SMALL. Yes; that is to go by way of Taylors Cut or Taylors Creek, and was adopted by Congress on condition that the locality should contribute \$10,000.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

New River and waterways to Beaufort, N. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance of New River and of inland waterways between Beaufort Harbor and New River and between New River and Swansboro, \$37,300.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out all of lines 19, 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas, who discussed Smiths Creek a few minutes ago. This is a project on which \$221,000 has been expended. Seventy-one thousand and fifty-six dollars is still available, and \$37,300 is asked for for improvements and for maintenance. I wish to read one particular paragraph here, not only for the benefit of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN], but other lawyers on the floor, and to get their professional opinion as to the rights of the Government, and I might say, parenthetically, also the opinion of the gentleman from Nebraska. I read from page 500 of the Engineer's Report in reference to this project:

Until June 13, 1906, no work, except a survey made in April and May, 1901, had ever been done on this waterway, for the reason that an act of the General Assembly of North Carolina, ratified February 13, 1889, had incorporated the Wrightsville & Onslow Navigation Co.



with the exclusive right to navigate said waterway, as set forth in House Executive Document No. 26, Fifty-second Congress, first session (p. 1147 of the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1892).

Here is the question:

On February 6, 1905, however, a paper was obtained from the two survivors of the four parties named in the charter of said Wrightsville & Onslow Navigation Co., in which paper it was declared that the privileges and franchises granted in said charter had never been exercised and that said privileges and franchises had "to all intents and purposes been surrendered and abandoned."

I wish to ask if a quitclaim deed by these two gentlemen to the Government is good. We started in to make the appropriations prior to the execution of the quitclaim deed by the two remaining members of the corporation. This was for a commerce for the year 1913, which amounted to 8,987 short tons.

I am reading from page 501 of the report—

at an approximate value of \$164,696.90, a decrease in one year of 8,485 tons below that of last year.

In other words, a decrease of practically 50 per cent in the commerce at this point, and for that reason, and with what we have before us—oh, here is one other item that may be interesting. There is a half page of commercial items in connection with this particular project, which is found on page 1996, with a grand total of 42,687 tons of traffic. One item of timber reaches 39,865 tons, leaving 2,822 tons for the remaining items which could be floated in very shallow water, ordinarily speaking. That is all I care to offer at this time, because I am not offering any argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered b. the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northeast, Black, and Cape Fear Rivers, N. C.: For maintenance of improvement of Northeast and Black Rivers and of Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C., \$13,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out all of lines 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that through the active aid of the engineers through the past year we have been enabled to maintain the depth in this river which was gained one year ago, because the Engineer's report reads identical with that of a year ago, and here is what they have accomplished with the money that has been expended on this river. The past appropriations are \$39,943. Here is the statement:

From Crooms Bridge to Kornegays Bridge, the head of navigation, the river is so shallow that navigation is practicable only when the water is up. This is liable to occur at any time, but during the summer low stages usually prevail.

[Laughter.]

I have not yet given you that part in which the engineers are entitled to great credit, however, for maintaining the average depth. In the very next paragraph of the report I find the following:

The minimum low-water depth to Bannermans Bridge is 6 feet; to Crooms Bridge, 3 feet; to Hallsville, 0.5 foot; to Kornegays Bridge (the head of navigation), 0.1 foot.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, what kind of boats do they use on that one-tenth of a foot?

Mr. STAFFORD. Stone boats. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Do I understand any navigation occurs on this part of the river where the water is only one-tenth of a foot deep?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I believe an expression used by the gentleman from Illinois last year is very proper at this time. At that time he said that the people living down there in that neighborhood should get out insurance on that particular stream.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I know the gentleman is familiar with these rivers in North Carolina.

Mr. FREAR. I lived there once for a short time.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman is a Tarheel, I understand.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; I was only there for a few months.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he has found any other locations in North Carolina where any other rivers could be located by the Government for the purpose of excavation? [Laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. That is a fair question, and I say that it is difficult in view of the fact that 20 of these North Carolina

projects are in this bill, while 26 of the projects appeared in the bill of last year from that one State alone. Mr. Chairman, I wish now to refer briefly to the character of commerce upon that creek.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I especially want to know what character of commerce goes over that section which is one-tenth of a foot deep.

Mr. FREAR. I give it up. The report says that the commerce is handled on a few boats that make some attempts at regular trips. The amount for the three years is \$16,500, and the commerce was 123,177 tons, of which number made up 71,545 tons, and also fertilizer—there is a fertilizing factory there near the mouth, it will be remembered, for we had an appropriation last year—41,927 tons. That fertilizing project is hauled 2 miles.

Mr. MADDEN. Does it cost \$13,000 to fertilize this ditch?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; apparently.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin think that \$13,000 a year is an excessive amount for the maintenance of a stream that carries 123,000 tons of freight?

Mr. FREAR. I am explaining to the gentleman from Texas the character of this commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Surely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are three of these rivers—the Northeast, the Black, and the Cape Fear Rivers—and the combined tonnage is 318,932 tons, for which this \$13,000 is allowed.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon an answer to my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. May I have five minutes more? [Cries of "Vote!"] I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can we close debate at the end of that five minutes?

Mr. SMALL. I would like to have three minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has the votes; why does he desire time?

Mr. DIES. I will withdraw the question, if that will expedite the matter.

Mr. FREAR. I would be very glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. I will be glad to withdraw the question if it will save any time at all.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes, five minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Three minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. SMALL. Three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin and two to myself.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not see what the gentleman from North Carolina wants with any minutes; he seems to have the votes and that is just as good as minutes.

Mr. SMALL. I merely want to make an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have three minutes and that I have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in five minutes, of which time the gentleman from Wisconsin is to have three minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C.: Continuing improvement, with a view to securing a navigable depth of 8 feet up to Fayetteville, \$173,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first three lines of page 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is a project on which there has been spent by the Government up to date \$346,160, on the Cape Fear River, above. There was available on October 14, after the allotment was made from the \$20,000,000 of the last bill, \$139,561. This is a proposition calling for \$615,000, as far as I have the figures here, but the expenditures, June 30, 1914, on all projects on this river have amounted to \$5,805,790. The



increase from the estimates of \$615,000 to \$1,031,000 was made by the engineers in four years after they discovered it was impossible to construct the project on the original estimate. The engineers' report further says, on page 511, "The improvement has had no effect on freight rates so far." Reading from page 508, of the engineers' report, "the commerce of 1913 was 154,000 short tons, a decrease in the commerce below last year of 53,384 tons. The river navigation is too unreliable at present to affect freight rates." The commerce amounted to 154,797 tons. Of that timber and floatable stuff amounted to 77,173 tons; fertilizer, 49,553 tons. The gentleman from Texas a few moments ago inquired whether or not I believe that was a condition that ought to be considered. I certainly do. Timber ordinarily is hauled on barges and in many cases is rafted in these streams and there is no particular depth required, provided it is sufficient to float the logs as we float them in all other parts of the country, but the engineers put that in as a part of the tonnage. When it comes to hauling fertilizer material they have here a 4-mile haul indicating the importance of the project which is continued for many miles, but it is not necessary for the benefit of the fertilizer factory which only requires the 4 miles.

That leaves a balance in this particular case of 28,000 tons and a loss of 20 per cent during the year. That is all I care to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$205,000.

Mr. FEAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, strike out lines 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. FEAR. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation of which the total amount spent on the river, as I stated before, has been \$5,805,790, and available on this particular project October 14, \$187,610. We are now asked to contribute by this bill \$205,000 more. Of the commerce in 1912 there was a loss, between 1912 and 1913, in the traffic of 28 per cent. It was a large commerce, reaching over a million tons in 1912 and 773,000 tons in 1910. Reading from page 513, it says:

The river and harbor act of February 27, 1911, made an appropriation of \$100,000 for continuing the improvement to such depth in excess of 20 feet as appropriations made for the work will permit, and provided also that not exceeding \$1,000 thereof might be used for clearing to a depth of 10 feet the channel or cut between the main channel of the river and the Carolina Beach Pier. This latter work was completed in May, 1911, which resulted in a channel 10 feet deep, 80 feet wide, and about 700 feet long.

The river and harbor act of July 25, 1912, modified the project so as to secure an available channel depth of 26 feet at mean low water and width of 30 feet, increased at entrance and curves in the river and widening to 400 feet across the bar, at an estimated cost of \$572,940, with \$80,000 annually for maintenance, in accordance with report printed in House Document No. 287, Sixty-second Congress, second session.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the very large amount of money that has been spent, nearly \$6,000,000, and that in October, 1914, \$187,000 was on hand, I believe it would be economical for us at this particular time to strike out the \$205,000 item.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shallotte River, N. C.: For maintenance, \$1,800.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after line 8, page 13, the following:

"For the improvement of the French Broad and Swannanoa Rivers, N. C., \$2,000 each."

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, with the passing of this item we leave the State of North Carolina, where we have sojourned so pleasantly for the past few hours; thence we go to the great Palmetto State of South Carolina. But I can not afford to leave the State of my good father, where he first saw the light of day, the old tar-heel State, without coming to the rescue of two streams that have been overlooked, not only by the gentleman who represents the committee from that State, but likewise by the entire committee itself.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have an eye for the attractive, for the majestic. I am not very poetic, but, sir, with my limited acquaintance, I know of no two streams so very attractive as the French Broad and the beautiful Swannanoa. Sir, should these streams be improved, as they should be, from pit to dome, from Alpha to Omega, from top to bottom, from center to circumference, from stem to stern, I dare say, sir, that a great and untold amount of commerce would flow from the topmost mountains of the great Blue Ridge Range gradually down into the sea.

Sir, if these rivers should be improved and the great and untold products in the Blue Ridge Mountains should be gathered, I can see now in my mind's eye many thousands and tens of thousands of pickaninnies gathered up from all over the Mississippi Valley and brought there in double-decked cars; see them detrain with glistening eye, with rubbering necks, with teeth a-grinning, with stomachs distending, and navels protruding, to gather the plentitude of wealth that grows spontaneously and indigenously on the tops of the Blue Ridge Mountains. [Laughter.]

What, sir, are some of these great inexhaustible products? I have just had occasion to look up the census returns, and these are the principal ones, namely, the pomegranate, the chin-kapin, the hazelnut, the possum grape, the touch-me-not, the squirrel's bark, the owl's hoot, and the wolf's howl; and last, but not least, sir, in great commercial quantities can be found the panacea to heal the ills with which all mankind is afflicted. Shall I call the name? It is owl grease. [Laughter.] I am told, sir, that owl grease is almost as plentiful as radium. And I am reliably informed by my good friend, Dr. FOSTER, that the total of all the radium in the world does not exceed two ounces and a half, as far as the estimates have gone. [Laughter.] But, sir, of owl's grease, I am reliably informed, there is almost half that much, and most of it can be found in the Blue Ridge Mountains, whence rise the Swannanoa and the French Broad Rivers.

Sir, if the gentleman representing that State upon this committee had been less practical and more poetic, he would have arisen in his place upon the floor and said: "Mr. Chairman, we have unintentionally overlooked two of the greatest and most important streams in my State, the French Broad and the Swannanoa." And then, sir, he would have dropped into poetry like this:

Swannanoa, nymph of beauty, I would woo thee with my rhyme.

And, instantler, every man on the floor of this House would have risen, each vying with the other, Mr. Chairman, to move to amend the amendment by giving each river not \$2,000, but \$500,000, that these majestic rivers might be improved, sir, from beginning to end and that the inexhaustible resources of the mountain tops might be gathered and at once be made available for the world's commerce. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Those products, sir, immeasurable in quantity—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not continue without receiving an allotment of time.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Goodwin] have three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. FEAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to strike out.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can make that motion, but he can not have five more minutes. The gentleman from Arkansas withdraws his pro forma amendment.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to speak in opposition to the amendment, which I understood was not pro forma. It was very substantial.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Dupré] is recognized.



Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I hate to say a few words which may come as an anticlimax to the very entertaining digression to which we have just listened. It so happens I know something about the Land of the Sky in North Carolina, and that I am familiar with the region traversed by the French Broad and the Swannanoa Rivers. I hate to take away from the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN] claim for originality of the suggestions that he has made, but it must be done.

My family have a summer home at a place called Skyland, N. C., within a short distance of Asheville and a few miles from both the French Broad and the Swannanoa. One summer, some years ago, a congressional campaign was on, and a meeting was held at Skyland, and long before I ever dreamed that I would be honored with membership in this body I attended that meeting and heard a gentleman who was elected to Congress—though he is not a member of the present Congress—and who was a candidate at that time, tell his constituents that if they sent him to Washington he would see to it that both the French Broad and the Swannanoa were made navigable. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Does not the gentleman think that if those two rivers were made navigable, these products, immeasurable as they are in quantity, indifferent in quality, and absolutely as valueless commercially as the activities of the members of this committee in procuring huge appropriations for their districts and States become invaluable for their own political longevity? [Laughter.]

Mr. DUPRÉ. I can not answer that question, Mr. Chairman; but I would say that it seems to me that the gentleman overlooked the possibilities of transporting a very important product of North Carolina, namely, "moonshine." [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, what was the last provision that the Clerk read? I think the last was the item before Winyah Bay.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that was the last.

Mr. FREAR. I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out lines 9 and 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Winyah Bay, S. C.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mr. FREAR. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 13, by striking out lines 9 and 10.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer this with some regret, and I do it in order to "play no favorites," to use a current expression. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], a member of the committee, has kindly and considerately taken all the criticisms, which of course are not to be lodged against him. We pass from that and we approach another State and another gentleman who is equally agreeable; and it is a matter of regret if he thinks this is a matter for him to defend. I believe the committee is properly in a position to defend the item.

I merely wish to read what the engineers' report shows. It shows that Winyah Bay has already had \$2,980,664, including the jetty, according to the report I have, and there was available on June 30 last, or on October 14 last, \$82,715 for this project. The only point to which I wish to call attention particularly is the engineer's statement that the precise percentage of reduction of rate does not appear to be susceptible of determination. That meets in a way the claim that these improvements are used for the purpose and having the effect of reducing freight rates.

There is quite an appreciable commerce at this point. It reached, in 1913, 211,000 tons, of which 177,000, or nearly three-fourths, was timber and crossties. But the point which interests me more particularly—and I think should interest the committee in finding out what we have received from this large appropriation—is the fact that in 1912 the commerce was 309,673 tons, and that there has been a loss during the year of over 30 per cent in the commerce. The 13 miles have cost us

\$200,000 a mile on an average; and while this may be a project which has merit in it, I believe we ought to save money wherever we can do so. For that reason I have made the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flint River, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$50,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 1 and 2 of page 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the Government has appropriated for this project \$381,500, according to the engineer's report. The amount available in October, 1914, after the allotment was \$18,037.

The report states that between Albany and Montezuma, 77 miles, the ruling depth is 2½ feet, much obstructed, although repeatedly cleaned of snags. The commerce is 33,594 tons, and the average haul 35 miles. I call attention particularly to the average haul, because we are improving this stream 105 miles. The average haul is one-third of the distance. That includes 6,234 tons of timber. The project is 92 per cent completed. We have been 34 years upon that project, and the engineer states in his report that the effect on freight rates can not be determined.

In view of the comparatively small commerce upon this stream, and in view of the fact that there is a reasonable amount of money on hand with which to meet any pressing emergency, I believe that it is inadvisable at this time to appropriate \$50,000 additional, and for that reason I move to strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Coosa River, Ga. and Ala.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance between Rome, Ga., and Dam No. 4, Ala., \$75,000; completing construction of the lock in Dam No. 4 and completing construction of Dam No. 5, in the State of Alabama, \$56,000; in all, \$131,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, strike out lines 14 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is one of the most inexcusable items in the bill, so far as my investigation has gone. The Government has appropriated thus far \$1,982,583 upon the Coosa River. In October, 1914, there was on hand for further use \$170,058. This appropriation calls for \$131,000.

At this point I want to read a letter in reference to the Coosa River, which, by the way, is a project that has been running for 38 years, since 1876. At the present rate of progress in the construction of it it will take between 100 and 200 years to complete it. Here is a letter that I have received from Montgomery, Ala., in which the gentleman says:

I noticed in a Birmingham paper several days ago where you had opposed the appropriation of the Muscle Shoals project of the Alabama Power Co., and that you intended to fight this to the end. I appreciated reading this very much and to know that there was at least one in Congress that would help us out down here.

The Alabama Power Co. built a dam on the Coosa River up in Chilton County of this State, and they were going to give everybody cheap electricity and they claimed it would do great things for the surrounding country. Well, it did great things all right; they made hundreds of people leave their homes, and caused great numbers to die with chills and malarial fever. They have ruined the country for 2 or 3 miles.

I will leave out the next paragraph.

The Alabama Power Co. is now furnishing Birmingham with electricity from this dam on Coosa River, and the rates are the same in Birmingham as they have always been. This Alabama Power Co. and their branch companies are trying their best to get a monopoly on the water power of this State and every other State that they can. This Alabama Power Co. has numbers of attorneys and men employed all over this State, and they are the ones that write the beautiful pieces in the papers about the great things this development of Muscle Shoals will do for Alabama.

I can get a petition, signed by thousands of men in Alabama, condemning this project, and these some of the best business men of the State. There have been filed in the courts of Chilton County some two hundred cases for damages on account of sickness caused from this dam on the Coosa River, and there are something more than 200 filed in Shelby County and about 200 in Coosa County, and some in Talladega County. These are the four counties which border on this pond of polluted water. Practically every man in these four counties of this



State will sign petitions condemning the power companies' monopoly on the death devices they have caused.

I do not care to read the rest of this letter. It is signed by J. B. Benson.

The engineer's report shows that the commerce on this stream last year was 46,339 tons, or a loss of 6,000 tons during the year. Of this commerce stone, sand, and gravel amounted to 20,876 tons, or 46 per cent. That was presumably used in the construction work, although I have no information on that except the suggestion that comes to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Fernandina, Fla.: For maintenance, including the entrance channel through Cumberland Sound, Georgia and Florida, \$40,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] for a moment. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman and the committee to the fact that we have been in session since 12 o'clock noon, and that during that time we have read less than 10 pages of the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and I am not criticizing him but saying it in good faith, in the paragraph that he has just read stated that it was one of the worst projects in the bill. He debated it and presented his views, and the result was that no one took that view of it. Now, in view of that fact and the condition of business, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will not, on most of the projects, if he wants to make a record, take leave to extend his remarks, and let us, in the next 20 minutes which remain, have a little reading of the bill. I think we have been courteous to him and he has been courteous to the House, but it is perfectly evident that it does no good, and is simply killing time. I ask that because I know the other Members of the committee feel the same way I do.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman from Washington has said, and I desire to say this: I have made an investigation of the bill honestly, and with an effort to arrive at the facts. The last project, which I stated was one of the worst, was discussed at the other end of the Capitol and the facts shown so strongly that it seemed to me that it called for the statement I made.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is the reason I made the statement. The gentleman said that this was one of the worst items in his view of the bill and he saw the result of the vote on it. Therefore I thought it would be a good opportunity to appeal to him not to consume time on all the paragraphs if this was a typical case. I made the appeal in view of the fact that we have consumed an entire day with reading but little of the bill.

Mr. FREAR. I desire to say that I have passed over a number of projects that were typical of others. At the last hearing of the bill, after we had finished the debate, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], who is an extremely courteous gentleman and was very kind throughout the discussion, called attention to the fact that I had only criticized several streams. Now, I am prepared to leave it to the country to judge of the facts in regard to the various projects. I want to say that I have not taken five minutes in each case.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I merely suggested that if the gentleman wanted to make a record, and no one wants to prevent him from doing it, that he should not debate a good many items, but extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. FREAR. I am doing pretty nearly that, for I do not average more than two or three minutes on an item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, strike out lines 23 and 24.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the general debate I took occasion to criticize the item which has just been read, and in answering me the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] mixed me up in some way with a newspaper story, and either the newspaper writer or I, and probably both, in his opinion, were worthy of membership in the Ananias Club. His remarks appear on page 1583 of the Record. That is not a

particularly honorable post, Mr. Chairman, to hold, and I prefer not to be rated in that class. He said in reference to me, "I do not know where he got his information, but if he refers to the item to belittle that inlet his information is as correct as the other statements," referring to the newspaper story.

I want to inform the gentleman from Florida that the information I supplied to the House in relation to St. Lucie Inlet was taken from the report of the engineer verbatim, which appears on page 1578 of my remarks and also on pages 598 and 599 of the engineer's report.

I do not want any better condemnation of the St. Lucie Inlet project, so dear to the heart of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], than the words of the engineer, and I refer him, and I refer the members of the committee, to the report of the engineers, on pages 598 and 599, for a description of the St. Lucie Inlet.

Mr. MADDEN. Read it.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have only five minutes. I will refer to it again, perhaps. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman sees fit to quote from a report made in House Document No. 1312, Sixtieth Congress, second session, telling about all the freight that would be handled out of the St. Lucie Inlet when the Government expends anywhere from \$900,000 to an indefinite amount upon the improvement of that artificial inlet. The gentleman took particular pains not to refer to a more recent report than that, both from the engineers, from the Chief of the War Department, and the various officials connected with this project. What he was advocating was the report from the engineers that has never been adopted by Congress, because it says so in so many words in the document No. 675, Sixty-second Congress, second session, and I read from that report:

None of the projects nor estimates above reported have so far been adopted by Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield. I am an Ananias Club man and I do not want to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to get the page.

Mr. TREADWAY. Page 2 of the War Department, office of the Chief of Engineers, and I quote the sentence, and I will read it again for the benefit of the gentleman:

None of the projects nor estimates above reported have so far been adopted by Congress.

And it was about these reports that the gentleman from Florida, who wanted to know where I got my information, was reading for the benefit of the House, when he said that I was a candidate for the Ananias Club. Let me read a little more from that same report. Here is what Gen. Bixby, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, says:

In view of the possibility of securing a cut of 18 feet across the bar at much reduced cost by a suitable dredging plant, using explosives only where actually necessary—

And I do not know why they were afraid of explosives, unless they were afraid of finding some water there—

and of the possibilities that such cut, even if of reduced width, may produce decided changes in the adjoining channels—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, to continue—

it is considered worth while to experiment on this bar to the extent of about \$300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am not prepared to vote the money of the Government for experiments on an artificially made channel in a district of the gentleman from Florida, who so earnestly advocated this proposition yesterday. Let me read a few more extracts, because he wanted to know where I got my information. I told him where I got my information that was in the Record yesterday, and I am telling him where I am now getting this information. Here is a statement from Col. Russell:

In the opinion of the board the project contemplated, if carried out, would be but a makeshift, and would at once be found inadequate to meet the needs of navigation—

And so forth.

Then, again, the officer stationed at Jacksonville has some extremely interesting statements to make. He says:

Most of the east coast of Florida labors under the same difficulties as to transportation as the country in the vicinity of St. Lucie Inlet. Adequate harbors are desired at a number of other points. If such improvements would relieve the situation, the commerce to be benefited would warrant their undertaking, but it is reasonably certain that that would not afford relief, because, in order to carry this produce by water, frequent and regular calls by ships would be necessary, as the



produce is perishable and can not be allowed to accumulate, but must be shipped promptly after it is gathered, and seagoing ships would not be warranted in stopping for the small amount of freight that would thus be offered.

He winds up by saying:

I am therefore of the opinion that St. Lucie Inlet is not worthy of improvement.

Very respectfully,

J. T. SLATTERY,

Captain of the Corps of Engineers, Stationed at Jacksonville.

I desire particularly, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this item for which we are now, in a condition of a depleted Treasury in this country, asked to appropriate \$100,000 was not carried in the bill passed by the House in 1914—the last year's bill. It was carried in the bill approved March 4, 1913, and read as follows:

Improving St. Lucie Inlet, Fla., in accordance with the smaller project—

Note that word, please—

the smaller project recommended by the Chief of Engineers—

In the report to which I have referred—

\$100,000.

In other words, all that is before this House is the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers that we should appropriate \$300,000 to experiment in St. Lucie Inlet and see what can come of it, in order that later they can then go to work and spend anywhere from \$900,000 to an indefinite sum.

Mr. FLEAR. How much has been spent on it?

Mr. TREADWAY. Seventy-two dollars so far has been spent. I maintain that it is time to call a halt on St. Lucie Inlet, and I further submit that this is a good time to begin, right now. I realize this House to-night is in a condition that it desires to continue the reading of this bill, but I called your attention to an item that, in my opinion, is of sufficient weight, even if it does not involve a whole lot of money, comparatively speaking—\$100,000—as against millions going into this bill—not a great deal of money, but it involves a principle which I for one feel we must condemn here and now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word or two. The gentleman reads from Document No. 675, which was the document upon which the committee acted when they adopted this report. The gentleman is unfair, because he reads from the report of Gen. Bixby, who was at that time Chief of Engineers, on page 2 of this report this language:

None of the projects or estimates above reported have been so far adopted by Congress.

And there he stopped. Why did not the gentleman go on, and show the final summing up of Gen. Bixby, who, after considering everything, all the reports, all the facts, everything in connection with it, his final summing up was this, and I call attention to it:

I have therefore, in carrying out the instructions of Congress—

And so forth.

Then he goes on with the summing up, all of which I will not take time to read, but he speaks of the different reports and different recommendations, and then he says:

But that an immediate expenditure of about \$300,000 in excavating a cut of 18 feet center depth across the obstructing rock and the ocean bar is now advisable as a preliminary step to securing later the full project channel of 18 feet depth, over at least 200 feet width, from the ocean to Sewalls Point, as described in House Document No. 1312, Sixtieth Congress, second session.

And that is what he recommended.

Mr. TREADWAY. At the cost of what? Finish it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. "At a cost possibly much less than the original estimate of \$1,460,000."

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it worth it?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is worth it if human life is worth anything, if property is worth anything, if the relief of hundreds of thousands of people against oppressive freight rates and monopoly of railroad rates is worth anything; yes, it is worth it; it is worth more than that. [Applause.] I did not charge the gentleman with being a member of the Ananias club, but I do say this, that any gentleman upon this floor who stating only a portion of the facts withholds the sum total of it all is not treating the House fairly, to say the least of it. I state, Mr. Chairman, that every engineer—Capt. Slattery opposed the 12-foot project. For what reason? If the gentleman will read the report he will find out, because in the opinion of Capt. Slattery 12 feet would not answer the purposes of the harbor. He insisted that there should be a greater project, an 18-foot project over that bar, and I assert without fear of successful contradiction that every engineer, the Board of Engineers, after making a visit to the premises, the Chief of Engineers, every

one of them has said that the harbor ought to be built at that place, and that the inlet was worthy of improvement.

Not only does commerce present and prospective justify it, but the additional reason, a harbor of refuge, was sufficient for them to recommend it. Here is a coast, and a treacherous coast, of about 600 miles, and not a single opening along all that stretch in which a vessel drawing 10 to 12 feet of water can go out of a storm. And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts opposes it because sometime in the dim, distant past he has fished on Indian River and tasted Indian River oranges. The Indian River is a shallow stream. The St. Lucie River is a deep and bold stream, penetrating some of the best lands of the whole State.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time of the committee. This is a project that is deserving.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The Committee divided.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to withdraw the point of no quorum until the decision on this question is made, and then I will make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of no quorum.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me on this important item we should have a quorum.

Mr. MANN. There is a quorum here.

Mr. NORTON. Well, I make the point.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 16, the noes 55, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five gentlemen are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Miami (Biscayne Bay), Fla.: Continuing improvement, \$50,000: *Provided*, That no work shall be done by the United States on said project until the Secretary of War is satisfied that suitable terminal facilities will be provided as contemplated by paragraph 8 of the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, as set forth on page 15 of House Document No. 554, Sixty-second Congress, second session: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as relieving the said Florida East Coast Railway Co. from the obligation of complying with the terms of its contract heretofore entered into with the United States.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pages 14 and 15: Strike out the entire paragraph beginning with line 25, on page 14.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take more than just a moment of the time of the committee to call attention to the fact that there never has been any harbor in Miami—Biscayne Bay—Fla., and there probably never will be. The arrangement to provide harbor facilities at Miami was the result of an effort of the Florida East Coast Railway, that tried to secure a sufficient depth from Miami to reach the ocean and run a line of steamers over to Habana. I had the pleasure of lying in Miami Harbor for two or three days waiting for a shallow-draft boat to be able to go over the bar, and in all probability there is not any more depth of water there now than there was then. Further than that, this demand on the part of the Florida East Coast Railway for navigable opportunity in Miami has entirely disappeared, from the fact that the railroad has now been extended down to Key West, and there is a short railway running out over the keys to Key West and a short boat line from Key West to Habana. Consequently Miami is now a resort solely, a delightful place to visit at this time of year; but that is all there is of it, aside from the fact that it is getting a little additional notoriety now, in that our honored Secretary of State has a winter home there. There is not a very large amount of free grape juice that I know of floating around over the waters of Miami Bay, but I have no doubt it would float just as big a vessel as will the water there. So the need for the project that we are contemplating here has gone by. We are simply throwing \$50,000 into the district of the genial gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], who has so ably defended the St. Lucie Inlet.



Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is a regular line of steamers running into Miami now. There are other vessels that run in there, too. The commerce of the port is 123,000 tons, I believe, and of \$3,000,000 in value. The Government is under a contract with the East Coast Railroad Co. to do certain work, and the East Coast Railroad Co. is to do certain other work. That company has not done the work, and now it is a question of whether Congress is to relieve the East Coast Railway Co. from doing it and leave those people without proper harbor facilities or not. Miami is a city of about 20,000 people, one of the most progressive, wideawake cities in this country, and I want to call attention just a moment to the report of the Chief of Engineers, which says:

The city of Miami decided, at an election held on May 12, 1914, to issue bonds to the amount of \$185,000 for the purpose of acquiring suitable terminal facilities to comply with the requirements of the act of Congress approved July 25, 1912.

Does the gentleman desire Congress to break faith with the people of Miami who in good faith are meeting the congressional requirement as to terminals, or does he desire to save the railroad from its contract to expend approximately one-half million dollars in improving this harbor? To strike out this item would accomplish both these things.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tampa Bay, Fla.: For maintenance, \$9,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word; and this time, following the suggestion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] objects.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FREAR. I want to discuss this project.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman want to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD instead of uttering them now?

Mr. FREAR. I wanted to extend the remarks that I am going to make on the floor and on the bill generally.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If the gentleman extends his remarks in the RECORD they will go in the back of the RECORD, apart from the bill we are considering. I believe differently from what the committee thinks. I want the country to know about this by seeing the RECORD, and by seeing the discussion right along with it. But I will withdraw my objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin should be given ample time in which to make any statement he desires. He has certainly not taken up as much of the time of the House as has the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the gentleman from Wisconsin should not be bluffed or browbeaten out of any time he desires.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not take that view.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to be as expeditious and as fair as I could to-night. I have sat here for over 10 hours continuously, it is now nearly 10.30, in an effort to give to the committee what information I have been able to get out of these engineers' reports. Members of the committee have told me heretofore that there are many things that have been inserted in bills that they were unaware of. For days we have been discussing other bills and propositions here, some of which are of no material importance to the people of this country.

As I said awhile ago, we discussed for weeks a printing bill, in an effort to save \$750,000 to the people of the country—and that is presumably a good thing—and when we got on this bill yesterday, for the first time, a great part of the time in general debate was taken up with politics by gentlemen who now insist that we sit here over 10 hours consecutively. With \$34,000,000 at stake and 250 items, they say we shall sit here 10 hours and over. We have been right here, and we will stay. On objection I am not to have the usual courtesy of extending my remarks in the RECORD. I do not believe—

Mr. DRISCOLL. No one objected.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] objected.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Oh, no.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman extending his remarks on items on which he made statements.

Mr. FREAR. There are some things I really want passed, without taking up the committee's time.

Mr. NORTON. I did not object to the gentleman extending his remarks.

Mr. FREAR. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. I renew my request, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks on the various items in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on various items in the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment, striking out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Hillsboro Bay, Fla.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$120,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to strike out this paragraph, covering lines 14 and 15 on page 15, for Hillsboro Bay, Fla.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, strike out lines 14 and 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have withdrawn my pro forma motion, originally made, which was to strike out the last word. Now I wish to strike out the last paragraph read, and I desire to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I was not aware until a day or two ago that this item related to the chairman of the committee [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I will say that it is quite a harbor, but I wish to present some facts in connection with it that may be of interest to the committee, in view of the large appropriation that is called for, namely, \$120,000.

The total appropriations that have been made for Hillsboro Bay amount to \$2,089,944. There was available July 1, 1914, \$494,406, almost half a million dollars. In the bill before us is a proposal to increase by \$120,000 the amount that shall be used.

This is an arm of Tampa Bay, 9 miles long. The project began in 1880, at 8 feet. In 1899 it was increased to 12 feet. In 1905 it was increased to 20 feet. In 1910 it was increased to 24 feet. In 1915 it may be still further increased, because it is not unlike other projects. They all begin in the same way. Every river that we have starts in the same way. Every harbor we have is in the same position. They start in a small way, at a small depth, and every foot added to depth later on increases geometrically in cost, because of the difficulty in digging at a great depth.

This project is subject to conditions. The city is obliged to construct a public wharf. I want to refer to one more thing, briefly, that the chairman of the committee discussed when this matter was under general debate. He said, "In order to show the uncertainty of engineers' reports on commerce, that in a case like this they failed to get the actual amount of commerce." I do not question the statement.

The engineer's report of the commerce for the year 1913 showed an apparent decrease of 33.4 per cent from 1912. There is quite a large commerce at that point. But while it is true, Mr. Chairman, that the engineer may have failed to get the full amount of commerce in 1913, it is probably equally true that he failed to get the full commerce in 1912 and in 1911. He has only limited means at hand, but from the investigation the engineer made—and surely the figures are favorable; we would not question the engineer's report in that particular—there has been a loss in one year of 33 per cent in traffic in this harbor. Last July there was available nearly half a million dollars, in round numbers. It occurs to me that if we want to save money in this bill it is wise to strike out this item for the present and try to get along without the additional \$120,000.

I realize that it is very hard to get favorable action on a proposition to strike out anything in this bill. As the gentleman from Illinois well said last year—and I was rather surprised



at it, but I have discovered the truth—no item that is put in this bill by the committee will be stricken out, and no item that is out can be put in. Consequently the committee are supreme in matters of this kind. But I assure you, gentlemen, it is a very dangerous position to occupy, to have to decide upon all these projects. It is a very difficult duty to perform.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman to say that there had been \$3,000,000 spent on this proposition?

Mr. FREAR. Two million and eighty-nine thousand dollars.

Mr. DONOVAN. At a place where the commerce is diminishing all the while at the rate of 33 per cent a year?

Mr. FREAR. Last year's report, of a 33 per cent loss, is the only one I have. There is still a large commerce there.

Mr. DONOVAN. When it was at its maximum what was the amount of the commerce?

Mr. FREAR. I have not the figures on that. It amounted last year to over a million tons, or more than that. In any event, it is quite a large commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Over 2,000,000 tons.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There was \$37,000,000 worth of commerce last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Apalachicola Bay, Fla.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including Link Channel and West Pass, \$15,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inquiring how much longer the gentleman from Florida intends to run. It is now 20 minutes after 10 o'clock, and there is no quorum present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If we can, I would like to finish the Florida items.

Mr. STAFFORD. At what time will the gentleman be willing to move that the committee rise? I am told by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] that there are 30 Florida items. I think he is speaking in hyperbole, but I suppose there are quite a number.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to go on until we get through with them, or until 11 o'clock, if I can.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of no quorum present, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members present, a quorum.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 8 ayes and 72 noes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no quorum is present. The announcement discloses that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just counted the House, and there were 101 Members present.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the Chair declare, in the face of the announcement that he has just made, that there is a quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that 8 voted aye and 72 voted no, and the Chair saw a great many Members that did not vote at all. The Chair just counted, and there were 101 Members present.

Mr. MADDEN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair. I submit that it is not the province of the Chair, no matter who, to say that there is a quorum present when he has just announced a vote which discloses that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count the committee again.

Mr. DIES. I make the point of order that the point made by the gentleman from Illinois is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will overrule the point of order and count the committee again. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for tellers.

Mr. FOSTER. I make the point of order that that is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Andrews Bay, Fla.: For maintenance, \$30,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 21—the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 21, strike out all of the line.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated \$239,560 for this project. There was on hand October, 1914, \$36,000, and \$30,000 is proposed in this bill. The engineer recommended \$60,000. The engineers' report says the completion of the project will serve to test the commercial value of the harbor. I call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWELL] to the language of the engineers' report that the completion of the project will serve to test the commercial value of the harbor.

The commerce on this stream, which apparently is intended for a sawmill, amounts to 116,622 tons. Timber is 102,557 tons, leaving 14,065 tons, which was presumably the material taken to the sawmill for the benefit of those taking it, and the haul was 11 miles.

The commerce in 1912 was \$76,562, showing an increase; but after deducting the timber it practically amounted to the same amount, \$12,844.

Mr. BRYAN. Was that timber brought down in logs or on a steamer?

Mr. FREAR. Logs and timber. My memorandum does not show which, but the point in question is covered by this statement that the haul is only 11 miles. It is a short haul. The project is for deepening the channel. We spent \$239,560. I appreciate that there is not much chance to get this stricken out. It may do no good, but let me say that I believe it is a duty I owe to the House to place before the committee such projects as these and to move to strike them out, leaving the responsibility with you.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment. I am as fond of a sincere and earnest discussion of these matters as any gentleman on this floor, but when the gentleman rises in his place, as he did a moment ago, and opposes an item contained in lines 14 and 15 for \$120,000 for continuing and improving the maintenance of a harbor which he says carries over \$2,000,000 of commerce—

Mr. FREAR. But there is a half a million dollars ready to be used.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman. Sixty-seven and six tenths per cent of all of the appropriations made by this Congress go to purposes of war, past and present, and if we are to spend almost a billion dollars for pensions and war preparations, does not the gentleman think that we will need some ports to carry commerce to enable the people of this Republic to pay the tremendous pensions and build the warships and support an army in this country? [Applause.] I am tired of this and of those who want to pare the river and harbor bill, that carries appropriations for the commerce of the country and the maintaining of the taxes and of the people that pay the taxes of this country. I do not doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman can pick some flaws in the bill. There never was a bill introduced in Congress that you could not criticize; but I do lay down the proposition, and I go to the length of my sincerity upon the proposition, that \$120,000 for continuing improvement and for the maintenance of a project that carries 2,000,000 tons of commerce is a captious objection, and we ought to stay here until midnight or the wee small hours of the morning to see that no such captious objections shall interfere with the progress of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 5, noes 83.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to call for those present and not voting. I was one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-nine gentlemen present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abercrombie	Bartlett	Bruckner	Chandler, N. Y.
Adair	Barton	Brumbaugh	Clancy
Ainey	Bathrick	Buchanan, Ill.	Claypool
Alexander	Beall, Tex.	Bulkeley	Cline
Allen	Bell, Ga.	Burke, Pa.	Coady
Anderson	Blackmon	Burke, S. Dak.	Connolly, Iowa
Anthony	Boober	Butler	Copley
Austin	Borland	Calder	Cox
Avis	Bowdler	Campbell	Cramton
Bailey	Britten	Cantrill	Dale
Baker	Brodbeck	Caraway	Danforth
Barchfeld	Broussard	Carew	Davenport
Barkley	Brown, N. Y.	Carlin	Davis
Barnhart	Brown, W. Va.	Carr	Deltrick
Bartholdt	Browne, Wis.	Cary	Dent



Dickinson	Hayden	Metz	Slayden
Difenderfer	Hayes	Mitchell	Slomp
Dillon	Helgesen	Mondell	Smith, Md.
Donohoe	Hensley	Montague	Smith, Minn.
Dooling	Hinebaugh	Morgan, La.	Smith, Saml. W.
Doolittle	Hobson	Morin	Smith, N. Y.
Doremus	Holland	Morrison	Smith, Tex.
Doughton	Houston	Moss, W. Va.	Stanley
Drukker	Howard	Mott	Stedman
Dunn	Howell	Murdock	Steenerson
Elder	Hoxworth	Neeley, Kans.	Stephens, Nebr.
Esch	Hughes, W. Va.	Neely, W. Va.	Stephens, Tex.
Estopinal	Hulings	Nelson	Stevens, Minn.
Evans	Igoe	Nolan, J. I.	Stevens, N. H.
Fairchild	Johnson, S. C.	O'Brien	Stringer
Faison	Johnson, Utah	Oglesby	Summers
Falconer	Johnson, Wash.	O'Hair	Sutherland
Fergusson	Jones	Oldfield	Taggart
Ferris	Kahn	O'Shaunessy	Talbot, Md.
Fess	Keister	Padgett	Talcott, N. Y.
Fields	Kelley, Mich.	Page, N. C.	Tavener
Finley	Kelly, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Taylor, Colo.
Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Conn.	Palmer	Taylor, N. Y.
FitzHenry	Kennedy, Iowa	Patten, N. Y.	Ten Eyck
Flood, Va.	Kennedy, R. I.	Patton, Pa.	Thacher
Fordney	Kent	Peters	Thomas
French	Kiess, Pa.	Peterson	Thompson, Okla.
Gallivan	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Phelan	Thomson, Ill.
Gardner	Kinkaid, N. J.	Platt	Towner
Garner	Kirkpatrick	Plumley	Townsend
Garrett, Tex.	Kitchin	Porter	Tribble
George	Knowland, J. R.	Post	Tuttle
Gerry	Korbly	Pou	Underhill
Gillett	Kreider	Powers	Underwood
Gilmore	Lafferty	Price	Vare
Gittins	La Follette	Prouty	Vinson
Glass	Langley	Ragsdale	Vollmer
Goldfogle	Lazaro	Rauch	Volstead
Good	Lee, Pa.	Rayburn	Walker
Gordon	L'Engle	Reed	Wallin
Gorman	Levy	Riordan	Walsh
Goulden	Lewis, Md.	Roberts, Mass.	Walters
Graham, Ill.	Lewis, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.	Weaver
Graham, Pa.	Lindbergh	Rothermel	Webb
Gray	Lindquist	Rouse	Whaley
Green, Iowa	Linthicum	Rubey	Whitacre
Griest	Lloyd	Rucker	White
Griffin	Loft	Rupley	Williams
Gudger	Logue	Sabath	Wilson, Fla.
Guernsey	Loneragan	Saunders	Wilson, N. Y.
Hamill	McClellan	Scott	Winslow
Hamilton, Mich.	McGillcuddy	Scully	Witherspoon
Hamlin	McGuire, Okla.	Seldomridge	Woodruff
Hardy	McKellar	Shackelford	Woods
Harris	McKenzie	Sherley	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	McLaughlin	Shreve	Young, Tex.
Haugen	Maher	Sims	
Hay	Manahan	Sisson	

The committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOSTER] having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20189, the river and harbor appropriation bill, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called; that 134 Members answered to their names, and he reported herewith the list of absentees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FOSTER having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAINEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20189, the river and harbor bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House again divided, and there were—ayes 72, noes 4.

So the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, January 16, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1489); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the vice president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railroad Co., transmitting annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1490); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, submitting data for the new edition of "Preliminary examinations, surveys, projects, and appropriations," with a view to having the same published complete in one document (H. Doc. No. 1491); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20107) to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1284), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20040) to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1286), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GITTINS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12896) to place Rev. John A. Ferry, captain, upon the unlimited retired list of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1283), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6011) to reinstate Frederick J. Birkett as third lieutenant in the United States Revenue-Cutter Service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1285), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19462) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Moulton, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 20931) making appropriations for the work of construction of irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20932) to provide for the retirement of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 20933) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," ap-



proved August 23, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20974) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAKES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 402) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVIS: A bill (H. R. 20934) granting a pension to William Cain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 20935) granting a pension to Sallie E. Gilkeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 20936) granting an increase of pension to Freeman H. Bentley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 20937) granting an increase of pension to George B. Henning; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 20938) granting an increase of pension to William J. Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20939) granting an increase of pension to Charles Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20940) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cutright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20941) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20942) granting an increase of pension to Jacob J. Roseboom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20943) granting an increase of pension to Wesley A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 20944) granting a pension to George Eskew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20945) granting an increase of pension to Perry C. McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 20946) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Swaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 20947) granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Pelham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20948) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 20949) granting a pension to Alexander Herndon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20950) granting an increase of pension to Spencer Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20951) granting an increase of pension to James W. Herndon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20952) granting an increase of pension to William C. McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20953) granting an increase of pension to Charles Luman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20954) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20955) granting an increase of pension to E. B. Wilhoit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20956) for the relief of James C. Downey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 20957) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Lookingbill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20958) for the relief of the heirs of William Grissom, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20959) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Newton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 20960) granting a pension to Nancy L. Gillespie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 20961) granting a pension to John F. Scribner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 20962) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 20963) granting a pension to Ellen Carrier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 20964) granting an increase of pension to Matilda A. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 20965) granting a pension to William M. Silver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 20966) granting an increase of pension to Cora Day Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 20967) granting a pension to Mary F. Carson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 20968) granting a pension to John O'Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOLLMER: A bill (H. R. 20969) granting a pension to Henrietta Borgstadt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20970) granting an increase of pension to Theodore H. Rosche; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 20971) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Small; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 20972) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 20973) granting an increase of pension to William Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVIS: Petition of citizens of the third congressional district of the State of West Virginia, favoring passage of House bill 5308 relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Rev. J. W. Hoffman, of Everett, and Earl Barefoot and William A. Reynolds, of Summerhill, Pa., protesting against amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill, relative to curtailing the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of G. R. C. Knights of St. George, of Summerhill, Pa., protesting against the sale of munitions of war by the United States to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of the German Evangelical Protestant Church of Pittsburgh, Pa.; the Allegheny County (Pa.) Branch of the National Federation of German Roman Catholic Societies of the United States; the German Roman Catholic Central Verein, of Carnegie, Pa.; and citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House joint resolution to prohibit export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of Golden West Lodge, No. 145, Knights of Pythias, of San Francisco, Cal.; the Woman's Progressive Club of the Mission; the Glen Park Outdoor Art League; Portola Parlor, No. 172, N. D. G. W.; La Estrella Parlor, No. 89, N. D. G. W.; members of the Foresters of America, Coast Sun Flower, No. 187; the Clement Street Merchants' Association, 400 members; Fourth and Fifth Street District Improvement Club, 196 members; Mission Parlor, No. 38, Native Sons of the Golden West; 265 members of the Central Mission and Hayes Valley Improvement Club; Golden Gate Parlor, No. 29, Native Sons of the Golden West; White Eagle Tribe, No. 72, Improved Order of Red Men; Indoor Yacht Club, 5,000 members; San Francisco Aerle, No. 5, Order of Eagles; Nelson A. Miles Camp, United Spanish War Veterans; Phelps Squadron, No. 12, U. S. V. N.; the Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations; Presidio Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, all of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Escondido Chamber of Commerce, Escondido, Cal., and Cabrillo Club, San Diego, Cal., favoring Federal appropriation for the construction of a military road from Yuma, Ariz., to El Centro, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of members of S. F. Schwaben Verein; Court California, No. 4, Foresters of America; Polk and Larkin Street District Association; Alpha Neighborhood Club; Lodge No. 2, K. R. A., of San Francisco; Oceanside Improvement Association; Richmond Central Improvement Club; members of Castro Parlor 232, Native Sons of the Golden West; Eureka Valley Merchants' Association; Haight-Ashbury Im-



provement Association, all of San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 5139, the Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of San Francisco Camp, No. 4, National Indian War Veterans, favoring the passage of House bill 15402, Keating bill, to place Indian war veterans who served from 1865 to 1891 on the regular Indian war veteran pension roll of earlier date; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of George F. Muench, Dietrich Krause, E. J. Weaver, A. C. Schmidt, and Johanne Kruse, of El Monte; George Hess, Charles H. Guenther, C. F. Guenther, and William H. Guenther, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring the adoption of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the shipment of munitions of war to the belligerent countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Papers to accompany bill for pension to Sallie E. Gilkeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions signed by John Rogies, William Behling, jr., and 76 other citizens of the city of Watertown, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war, save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of John Graf and 48 others, of Unionville; G. F. Wacker and 133 others, of Pigeon; Henry Gebhardt, of Minden City; F. P. Gerlach and 29 others, of Macomb County; Adolf Matthes, of Sebewaing; Charles Pagel and John Pagel, of Sandusky; and William F. Junke, of Goodrich, all in the State of Michigan, in support of House joint resolution 377, proposing to prohibit exportation of arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Gas Engine & Power Co. and Charles L. Seabury & Co., protesting against the passage of the Alexander bill (H. R. 18686); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of Mr. Fr. Bruckmaier and 25 others, of Attica and Batavia, N. Y., protesting against violations of the spirit of neutrality in connection with the war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Knights of St. Theodore, Rochester, N. Y., against export of arms to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of Hutchinson County, S. Dak., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON: Petition of 140 business men of fourth congressional district of Indiana, favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Memorial of Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, relative to amendment to the present tariff laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Evangelical Lutherans of St. Peters congregation, Dorchester, Wis., and George A. Walz and 245 other citizens of Norwalk, Wis., urging legislation to prohibit the exportation of war materials from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of civilian clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, favoring the passage of Senate bill 6882; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Boston (Mass.) Marine Society, protesting against the passage of House bill 18686; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, relative to strict neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Memorial of Bennington (Vt.) Board of Trade, urging passage of House bill 19434, for the improvement of the Narrows of Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of citizens of Appleton, Wis., and of the ninth congressional district of Wisconsin favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid shipment of arms to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of W. Ed Mathis, Joseph Schaefer, John F. Land, John F. Baker, A. H. Kattman, John P. Miedreich, Clarence F. Whiting, Carl P. Grimmeissen, C. A. Lefler, Albert F. Horn, John H. Borgman, John Hudson, Philip A. Hoelscher, E. J. Miller, Edward M. Schaefer, A. C. Richardt, William E. Wilson, Louis H. Moser, John F. Richardt, John A. Schaefer, Carl Lauenstein, George J. Stockmeyer, Peter Hass, Oscar E. Rahm, Harry C. Dodson, W. E. Willis, William P. Miedreich, Sidney Craig, Charles F. Forster, A. L. Rose, Henry Bernhardt, all of Evansville, Ind., and L. T. Freeland, of Princeton, Ind., favoring Hamill bill for retirement of aged and infirm Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Charles H. Bohrer and George Kuntzman, of Boonville; Anton G. Jochim, of Mariah Hill; Rev. C. G. Kettelhut, of Mount Vernon; and the St. Joseph's Society, by George Bischof, president, and Engelbert Schnellenberger, secretary, of St. Meinrad, all in the State of Indiana, in favor of legislation to prohibit the shipment from the United States of munitions of war to a belligerent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Paynesville, Minn., protesting against the shipment of arms to the warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Bertha, Minn., protesting against shipment of arms to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Cass Lake, Clear Water, South Haven, Elrosa, and Pierz, Minn., protesting against the shipment of arms and munitions of war to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 57 citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to export of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petitions of citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to shipment of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Resolutions of the Petaluma Central Labor Council, of Petaluma, Cal., favoring the passage of H. R. 5139, to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of three fraternal organizations in the city of San Francisco, Cal., comprising a membership of 450 citizens, favoring the passage of H. R. 5139, to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin: Petition of Men's Bible Class of Oshkosh, Wis., 900 names, asking for the passage of H. R. 377, relative to shipment of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of Baker County (Oreg.) Union of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, favoring rural credit legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Protest of Coldwater Council, No. 452, United Commercial Travelers, of Coldwater, Mich., against advancing passenger rates by railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Adam Ehrman and 171 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring S. 6688, to prohibit sale of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Bethel Baptist Church, of Buffalo, and Federation of German Catholic Societies of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring passage of resolution to prevent shipment of war material to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of St. Boniface Society, of Lyons, Iowa, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 16, 1915.

(Legislative day of Friday, January 15, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are only half a dozen Senators in the Chamber. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hughes	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brady	James	Owen	Sterling
Bryan	Johnson	Page	Swanson
Burleigh	Jones	Perkins	Thomas
Barton	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kern	Robinson	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Culberson	Lane	Shafroth	Weeks
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	White
Fletcher	Lippitt	Shively	Works
Gallinger	Lodge	Simmons	
Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Hollis	Nelson	Smith, Md.	